

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



Investigating meaning-making in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

Batziakas, Vasileios

Awarding institution:
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**INVESTIGATING MEANING-MAKING IN
ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA (ELF)**

VASILEIOS (BILL) BATZIAKAS

**PhD thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in
Language, Discourse and Communication**

**King's College London
University of London
2016**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	6
ABSTRACT	13
CHAPTER 1.	
INTRODUCTION	15
1.1. Personal background and orientation	15
1.2. Overview and organisation of the thesis	20
CHAPTER 2.	
LITERATURE REVIEW	28
2.1. Introduction	28
2.2. From the spread of English to the worldliness of English	29
2.3. Terms and models of English in the world	38
2.4. The paradigm of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)	47
2.4.1. The underlying tenets of ELF	47
2.4.2. Major themes in ELF studies	54
2.4.3. ELF wordings and pragmatics	56
2.5. Research focus and questions of the study	64
2.6. Summary	71
CHAPTER 3.	
CONCEPTUAL CONSIDERATIONS AND METHODOLOGICAL DECISIONS	72
3.1. Introduction	72
3.2. Theoretical framework	73
3.2.1. ELF difference and not ENL deficiency	73
3.2.2. ELF users and not ENL learners	77
3.2.3. Successful ELF communication and not failed ENL discourse	80
3.3. Research design	83
3.3.1. Approaches to language and language analysis	83
3.3.1.1. An ethnographic perspective	83
3.3.1.2. Elements from conversation analysis	90
3.3.1.3. Complementary analytic tools	100
3.3.2. Data collection	103
3.3.2.1. Naturally occurring spoken discourse	103
3.3.2.2. Participants and site of the research, and complementary data sources	111
3.4. Summary	121

CHAPTER 4.	
MAKING SPECIFIC MEANING THROUGH TRANSLANGUAGING	123
4.1. Introduction	123
4.2. Outlining the relevant concepts and notions	124
4.3. Filling in a lexical gap	137
4.3.1. <i>Diaosi</i>	137
4.3.2. <i>Hold zhu</i>	141
4.3.3. <i>Çok sert</i>	145
4.3.4. <i>Chamak chalo</i>	148
4.4. Using some more precise lexis	152
4.4.1. <i>Kefi</i>	152
4.4.2. <i>One bell, flash</i>	156
4.5. Discussion	161
4.6. Summary	167
CHAPTER 5.	
ACHIEVING POLITENESS THROUGH TRANSLANGUAGING	169
5.1. Introduction	169
5.2. Outlining the relevant concepts and notions	170
5.3. Displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English	179
5.3.1. <i>I have seeds</i>	180
5.3.2. <i>Blin</i>	184
5.3.3. <i>Madar chod</i>	190
5.4. Increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background	194
5.4.1. <i>Spasibo, xie xie</i>	196
5.5. Discussion	201
5.6. Summary	206
CHAPTER 6	
ATTAINING CULTURAL APPROPRIATENESS BY MEANS OF NEGOTIATION	208
6.1. Introduction	208
6.2. Outlining the relevant concepts and notions	209
6.3. Refining the culturally contested elements of an expression ...	222
6.3.1. <i>All the goods of Abraham</i>	222
6.3.2. <i>Bringing home the bacon</i>	227
6.3.3. <i>Hit the bull's eye</i>	231
6.4. Replacing a culturally contested expression altogether	236
6.4.1. <i>Too many chiefs and not enough Indians</i>	236
6.4.2. <i>Merry Christmas</i>	241
6.5. Discussion	246
6.6. Summary	252

CHAPTER 7.	
MANAGING THE RELATIONAL AND BUILDING RAPPORT WITH WORD PLAY	254
7.1. Introduction	254
7.2. Outlining the relevant concepts and notions	255
7.3. Making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group	268
7.3.1. <i>I was bringing the soy sauce</i>	269
7.3.2. <i>I've crossed the Rubicon River</i>	275
7.3.3. <i>Himalayan blunder</i>	280
7.3.4. <i>From Guatemala to Guatepeor</i>	284
7.4. Making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience	288
7.4.1. <i>It's all Greek to me</i>	289
7.4.2. <i>For a rainy day</i>	295
7.5. Discussion	300
7.6. Summary	307
CHAPTER 8.	
IMPLICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS	309
8.1. Introduction	309
8.2. Language and linguistic theoretic implications	310
8.2.1. Revisiting communicative competence and related models of competences	311
8.2.2. Reconceptualising language functions and social semiotics	327
8.2.3. Reappraising the practice of translanguaging in superdiverse contexts	337
8.3. Pedagogical applications for ELT	342
8.3.1. Language planning and policy: curriculum and syllabus design	343
8.3.2. Coursebooks and materials development	348
8.3.3. Teaching approaches and methods	354
8.3.4. Testing and assessment	359
8.4. Summary	364
CHAPTER 9.	
CONCLUSION	366
9.1. Main topics and findings of the study	366
9.2. Methodological and analytical reflections	372
9.3. Closing remarks and directions for future research	376
REFERENCES	379

APPENDICES	421
1. Abbreviations list	421
2. Transcription conventions list	423
3. Participants' profile	430
4. Naturally occurring spoken discourse outline	432
5. Post-event interviews outline	442
6. Official college documents	445
6.1. <i>Research ethics approval application</i>	445
6.2. <i>Research ethics risk checklist</i>	456
6.3. <i>Information sheet for the participants in research studies</i> ...	458
6.4. <i>Consent form for the participants in research studies</i>	461

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

So many people have helped me in so many ways regarding so many aspects of this PhD thesis all these years, that now that I am writing the 'Acknowledgements' section I realise one thing: The person who came up with the idea to include an 'Acknowledgements' section in the beginning of a PhD thesis for the first time must have felt not only an overwhelming but also a rightful need to do so. Indeed, whereas the 'References' section is there to refer to all these scholars and their work whose content was useful enough to be read through, thought about, built on, and eventually cited in the thesis, there is also a great variety of other people whose contribution to the thesis was of paramount importance. The 'Acknowledgment' section then, that person must have felt, is the appropriate place to somehow 'pay tribute' to them, as it were. I feel the same need here now, and below I would also like to thank each and every of all the people whose contribution to this PhD thesis has been a *sine qua non*.

Over and above anyone else, I cannot even think to start my 'Acknowledgements' section without first mentioning my two PhD supervisors at King's College London, Prof. Constant Leung and Dr Martin Dewey. From the very first time when I submitted my PhD thesis proposal, they seemed to have believed in it as a proposal aiming at addressing some important and useful issues in the field of ELF. At the same time, they seemed to have believed in

me as a student who was able and willing to attend to the level of intellectual enquiry which a PhD programme requires, as well as to live up to all the other expectations which make King's College London not only one of the most exciting institutions but also one of the most rigorous ones to study in. From then onwards, Prof. Constant Leung, one of the most internationally recognised applied linguists nowadays, always adopted an overarching approach and view to everything, which in turn contributed significantly in the way that I started approaching and viewing everything related to my thesis, from the topic and the research questions to ELF in general to language as a whole and even to the role of the PhD thesis considered in its entirety. To all these, I could certainly add his genuine interest in me and in many of my academic as well as other personal matters of mine emerging from time to time and calling for his attention, due to which so generously he was spending his time and so wisely he was giving me his advice. On the other hand, Dr Martin Dewey, one of the most prominent and pioneering ELF scholars to this date, shared with me his deep understanding of ELF as well as his latest ideas about what ELF needed as a scholarly field. At the same time, discussing many of his books and articles or presentations both before and after they were published or presented, and experiencing first hand his belief in ELF, always sustained my interest in ELF and in my PhD thesis in general. For all these reasons, I am truly honoured and lucky that they were both my PhD supervisors, and being the first ones to be thanked here is more than well deserved.

In addition to my two PhD supervisors at King's College London, there have been a great many other ELF scholars, whose influence on the way that I came to think about ELF has been profound enough for them to be worthy of being mentioned here too. Indeed, one cannot write anything related to ELF, not even perhaps come to grips with ELF, without reading some of the dozens of books or book chapters or articles of Prof. Jennifer Jenkins, Prof. Barbara Seidlhofer, Prof. Anna Mauranen, and of course Prof. Emeritus Henry Widdowson as well. Thus, I would like to thank all four of them here for their writings, as well as for taking the time patiently and comprehensively enough to answer my questions and reply to my comments every time that I was meeting them in the annual ELF conferences or on other occasions around the world. Further to them, special thanks have to go to Prof. Andy Kirkpatrick, Prof. Tim McNamara, Prof. Elana Shohamy, Prof. Edgar Schneider, Prof. Li Wei, Prof. Zhu Hua, Prof. Julianne House, Prof. Christiane Meierkord, Prof. Prof. Yasukata Yano, Dr. Aya Matsuda, Dr. Alan Firth, Dr Marco Modiano and Dr David Graddol (the names are provided in order of recollection, and the same is the case in the rest of this section as well). Meeting them at the ELF conferences and hearing what they had to say about ELF from the perspective of their own academic backgrounds and interests helped me shed light to many ELF-related areas which perhaps otherwise I would have left less attended. The same was the case with other scholars thanks to the discussions we had in conferences and colloquia around the world, such as Prof. Michael Silverstein, Prof. Shirley Brice Heath, Prof. Charles Briggs, Prof. Fred Erickson, Prof. Alessandro Duranti, Prof. Nick Coupland, Prof. Adam Jaworski, Prof. Mike Baynham, Prof. Jürgen Jaspers,

Prof. Bernard Spolsky, Prof. Arturo Tosi, Prof. Diane Larsen-Freeman, Prof. Elsa Auerbach, Prof. Barbara Johnstone, Prof. Betsy Rymes, Prof. Heather Lotherington, Prof. Janet Maybin, Prof. Lili Chouliaraki, Prof. Anneta Pavlenko, Prof. Pauline-Rhea Dickins, Prof. Peter Auer, Prof. Jim Cummins, Prof. Claire Kramsch, Prof. Alastair Pennycook, Prof. Adrian Blackledge, Prof. Angela Creese, Prof. Angel Lin, Prof. Christian Matthiessen and Prof. David Crystal.

Also, I feel that thanks are also due to Prof. Kurt Kohn, Prof. Yesemin Bayurt, Dr Jagdish Kaur, Dr Susan Ehrenreich, Dr Beyza Björkman, Dr Alessia Cogo, Dr Nicos Sifakis, Dr Andrew Blair, Dr Enric Llurda, Dr Will Baker and Dr Christopher Hall. Year after year in the ELF conferences, their presentations, as well as our follow up discussions, shaped considerably the way that I understand ELF. In the same vein, I am more than sure that my thesis was also benefited from Dr Angelika Breiteneder, Dr Marie-Louise Pitzl, Dr Janus Mortensen, Dr Stuart Perrin, Dr Niina Hynninen, Dr Karolina Kaloscai, Dr Pinar Ersin, Dr Robert Baird, Dr Ying Wang, Dr Toshie Mimatsu, Dr Yumi Matsumoto, Jill Doubleday, Sonia Moran Panero and Melissa Yu. Some of them were already PhD students when I started by PhD thesis, and their advice clarified many theoretical and practical issues which I had to deal with at various points. Some of the rest started their PhD thesis after I had already become a PhD student, and their questions to me made me investigate ELF even more in order to help them by providing them with the best possible answer myself. With many of them, I have discussed various versions of some of my first ELF publications (Batziakas 2013, 2016, forthcoming)

This is also a good opportunity to thank Robin Walker, who trusted me to contribute a section (Batziakas 2010) to his book *‘Teaching the Pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca’* (Oxford University Press, 2010); and Dr Roberto di Scalla, who trusted me to become his co-editor of the book *‘English Language Education: Contemporary Implications and Applications’* (IGI Global, forthcoming). Many aspects of my PhD research study found their way towards these two publications, and in turn many of their aspects proved to be useful regarding what I set out to investigate. The same was the case with the classes which I started teaching at the Master’s programme ‘Applied Linguistics for ELT’ and the In-sessional programme for EAP at the Language Centre of Queen Mary University of London, and thanks have to go to Prof. Kathryn Richardson, Prof. Saima Sherazi, Dr Falco Pfalzgraf and Dr Agnieszka Lyons for that matter.

Outside the ELF community, many academics in my Centre at King’s College London, the Centre of Language, Discourse and Communication, were of paramount importance too. In particular, I would like to refer here to the ones who frequented our weekly Research Workshop of Language and Literacy (RWLL), and in particular Prof. Emeritus Brian Street, Prof. Ben Rampton, Prof. Guy Cook, Prof. Celia Roberts, Prof. Alexandra Georgakopoulou, Dr Roxy Harris, Dr Ursula Wingate, Dr Eva Ogiermann, Dr Nick Andon, Dr Simon Coffey and Dr Mel Cook. Surely, they were not ELF scholars, but perhaps this is how they helped me with my ELF-related thesis, in so far as every so often I had to find ways to see how ELF can be enriched by their research, as well as at times I had to find the best way to argue that ELF can in turn enrich their research too.

Also, I would say that Prof. Jan Blommaert, Prof. David Block, Prof. Ken Hyland, Dr Fiona Hyland, Dr Catherine Wallace, Dr Catherine Walter and Dr Amos Paran, who were some of my tutors at my Master's course in TESOL at the Institute of Education of the University of London, and some others at the Institute of Education back then, such as Prof. Gunther Kress, one way or another, had a special contribution to this thesis. This is so, because it was some of them who consolidated my initial idea that a PhD was worth pursuing, some of them who advised me to choose an ELF-related topic for my PhD thesis, some of them who had a look at my initial PhD thesis proposal, and so on. Likewise, before my Master's degree, my initial interest in English and in applied linguistics was further developed by some of the tutors of my Bachelor course in English Language and Philology at the University of Athens, such as Prof. Sophia Papaefthymiou-Lytra, Prof. Bessie Dendrinos, Prof. Anastasia Papaconstantinou, Prof. Spyronicolas Hoidas, Prof. Mary Sifianou, Prof. Angeliki Tzanne, Prof. Maria Sidiropoulou, Dr Elli Yfantidou and Dr Kia Karavas.

Moreover, all these years, I was happy enough to have among my classmates and friends some scholars, such as Dr Miguel Pérez Milans, Dr Philip Sergeant, Dr Lin Pan, Dr Xuan Wang, Dr Shuang Gao, Dr Taehee Choi, Dr Tiffany Chiu, Dr I-Fen Lin, Dr Gina Roach, Dr Irene Theodoropoulou, Dr Anna Charalambidou, Dr Joanna Charalampous, Dr Johanna Woydack, Dr Fiona Willans, Dr Emily Heavy, Dr Olivia Knapton, Dr Weronika Gorska, Dr Agnieszka Tytus, Dr Polly Mercer, Dr Nicola Bretscher, Dr Alan Runcieman, Dr David Pepper and Dr Vasileios Zorbas. What they offered me was nowhere else to be

found, as all them were good friends of mine and thus their thoughts about various issues which had to do with my thesis were always nothing but sincere ones. On a more personal level, a lot of other issues emerging all these years, whether they had much or little to do with my thesis, were always carefully looked into and helpfully sorted out with the help of a variety of other friends of mine, such as Adrian Clark, Andrew Dakoutros, Vasilis Papapostolou, Manos Protonotarios, Thomas Georgas, Alexandros Pylarinos, Alexandros Nafpliotis, Costas Frangos, Christos Velentzas, Arjun Mundodh, Adrian Chung, and Hyejin Kim.

Last but not least, the 'Acknowledgement' section of my PhD thesis would be unbearably and inexcusably incomplete if there was no reference to my parents, Paul and Salvy. Although their professional interests were different from mine and thus they had to be economical with the time which they could afford discussing with me the intricacies of such a long piece of writing over such a long period of time, they were both generous with their understanding of why this PhD research project was so important for my personal and professional development.

Drawing knowledge and skills as well as being multifariously inspired and supported by all the aforementioned, has made this PhD thesis a reality.

ABSTRACT

This PhD research study looks at meaning-making practices in interactions of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). In particular, two research questions are investigated: Which wordings and features of discourse are characteristic of interactions in contexts where English is used as a lingua franca, and how do they contribute to meaning-making? To what extent do successful ELF interactions require competencies, skills and practices which are additional to those already described in the literature, and how can they best be described and accounted for? The data comprised naturally occurring spoken discourse from international students who were holding meetings in order to establish an international student society at the University London, and were analysed qualitatively drawing eclectically on the analytic traditions of ethnography and conversation analysis. In the first analytical chapter, it was found that the students were making specific meaning through translanguaging, and this contributed to the achievement of the pragmatic functions *'filling in a lexical gap'* and *'using some more precise lexis'*. In the second chapter, it was shown that the students were again translanguaging setting out to be polite by achieving the pragmatic functions *'displaying discursive sensitivity through avoiding profanity in English'* and *'increasing politeness through showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background'*. In the third analytical chapter, it was yielded that the students negotiated the meaning of culturally contested expressions, and thus the functions *'refining the culturally contested elements of*

an expression' and *'replacing a culturally contested expression altogether'* were achieved. Finally, in the fourth analytical chapter, what was argued was that there were instances in which the students were attempting to manage the relational and build rapport with their interlocutors with word play through the functions *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group'* and *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience'*. Subsequently, the implications of the findings were discussed from the perspective of their significance regarding revising communicative competence and related models of competence, reconceptualising language functions and social semiotics, and reappraising the practice of translanguaging in superdiverse contexts. Finally, it was shown that these findings could be pedagogically useful for English language planning and policy from the particular perspective of curriculum and syllabus design, coursebooks and materials development, teaching approaches and methods, and testing and assessment.

CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Personal background and orientation

I am of the opinion that many times authors' pieces of writing do not first start life at the time of typing or handwriting the first word, but they have their roots in the authors' personal memories and experiences, which may date back even a long time in the past and which may have taken place in settings which at first glance may even deem rather tangential to the actual piece of writing. These memories and experiences may have to be conjoined by some kind of personal interest or professional need, in order for a piece of writing to come into existence. Needless to say, this is not the case for every author and for every piece of writing, but it is certainly the case for me and for this thesis. As such, I would like very briefly to make reference to some of these past memories and experiences of mine, and then explain how they contributed to my interest in this thesis' overarching paradigm, English as a Lingua Franca, as well as in its specific focus, meaning-making.

When I moved from Athens to London to study for my master's degree in TESOL at the Institute of Education of the University of London (currently UCL Institute of Education), the English language became even more important. I had decided to further my professional development based on English. I had

decided to come to England and in particular to its capital city, London, with the idea to be exposed to and pick up the best variety of English, whatever 'best' and 'variety' could mean to me back then. I had also decided to stay at one of the biggest intercollegiate halls of residence of the University of London, Connaught Hall, with the idea to be able to engage in as much interaction and in as many activity types and episodes of language reception and production with as many other students/residents-interlocutors as possible, something which I would not be able to achieve otherwise. And, in the same vein, I was expecting that the modules and the tutors on my programme would scaffold me towards better English, again, whatever 'better' and 'English' could mean to me at that point.

Up to that point, due to my previous BA in English Language and Philology at the University of Athens, I used to believe that language is a system for communication primarily based on grammatical morphemes and phonemes, in the way that de Saussure describe it in his *Course in General Linguistics* (2013 [1916]) and later Bloomfield in his *Introduction in the Study of Language* (1914), which were codified and decodified by ideal speakers and ideal listeners in a homogeneous speech community, which was followed up by Chomsky in his *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965). And I used to say that "There is language and there are all the other things which someone can do with language", drawing from the title rather than from the content of a book which had once caught my eye but nothing more up to then, Austin's *How to Do Things With Words* (1962). In addition, I thought that one's L1 background was

something which could of course sometimes facilitate but which more often than not interfere with foreign language reception and production in the way that it had been treated in the studies on SLA and in particular on contrastive analysis, error analysis, interlanguage, transfer, and their interrelated discussions about language plateau and fossilisation. In turn, I considered that the English language belonged to the English people or more to the point that it belonged only to the English people, that the English language usage and use were exemplified only by them, and that in turn everyone else's English language development was to be measured against this yardstick. That is, I construed English as a monolithic and objectified construct, which I thought it could and should be taught and learned with every effort in order to reach a native or at least a native-like accent, grammatical accuracy, speech delivery rate, and so on. Needless to say, all these were the theoretical underpinnings or even the topics of some articles I had written until then (e.g. Batziakas 2006a, b, 2007).

But this was soon to start changing little by little but once and for all. In the modules which I was attending on my master's programme, it was the first time that I came across or at least it was the first time that I paid so much attention to notions and terms such as Grice's 'cooperative principle' and 'maxims of conversation' (1957); Austin's 'locution', 'illocution' and 'perlocution' (1962), and Searle's 'speech acts' (1969, 1976); It was also the first time that I elaborated on fundamental issues in applied linguistics such as the ones' derived from Hymes' ethnographic approach to language communication (1962, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1974), Canale and Swain's four-partite model of 'communicative

competence' (1980), and Leung's contribution to it with his 'convivial communication' (2005). All these helped me realise that communication is a multifaceted enterprise which calls upon many more resources than the knowledge of only formal aspects of language such as grammatical accuracy, and so on.

All these had to do more or less with all languages in general, but with regard to the English language in particular the body of literature about ELF which was then becoming available to me, with first and foremost Jenkins' book *The Pronunciation of English as an International Language* (2000), brought about a conceptual shift to me regarding one more issue: I refer here to the fact that, essentially, communication takes place in English notwithstanding any L1-attributed 'mispronunciations' and 'ungrammaticalities' of the interlocutors. Indeed, little by little, I was coming to realise that this had also been the case with me all these years, in so far as I had partaken in numerous instances of English language reception and production during which there were 'departures' in many linguistic aspects from what would be the norm in native varieties of English and nevertheless intelligibility was not hindered at all. This was clarified in my mind at the *First International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca* in Helsinki, and at the *2nd International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca* in Southampton. It is noteworthy that the views on language usage and use which I had started adopting, along with the developments in ELF, led me to try to address some related issues in two instances. The first one was at the ELF conference in Helsinki, as I mentioned above, where I discussed ELF's

detachment from the British culture and how this can further inform choices in English language pedagogy such as the topics of the coursebooks in the state school classes of English in Greece and in similar educational contexts (Batziakas 2008 a, b). The second one was in Robin Walker's *Teaching the Pronunciation of ELF* (2010), an Oxford University Press book, in which I was asked to contribute by discussing the ELF core from the perspective of how Greek-L1 students could attend to it in ELF contexts (Batziakas 2010).

Returning to London to start my PhD programme at King's College London at the University of London in September 2009, I knew that I had been formally learning English for so many years, I had been teaching English for so many years too, I had lived in England, I had published and presented on and in English, and I had also lived and traveled abroad extensively using English as well in order to communicate with speakers from differing linguacultural backgrounds. However, this time, I started realising something very interesting which I could see unfolding in my interactions with all my interlocutors. This time I was noticing that my interlocutors and I were making meaning and we were communicating, not because we were managing to let pass one another's variation in lexis and grammar and so on. Neither because what we were saying was bearing a culturally loaded meaning which was injected in our discourse and in so doing it was achieving a pragmatic function which was not readily available to all of us, but we could nevertheless work around it. It seemed to me that these would have to do with looking at language from a linguistic deficit perspective, whereas what was the case now had to do with quite the opposite.

This time, I was becoming more and more aware that we could communicate thanks to a variety of linguistic choices that we were making and in turn thanks to the pragmatic functions that these choices were achieving in our interactions from the perspective of meaning-making and effective communication. In addition, what I was finding more and more interesting was that this meaning-making was taking place through pragmatic functions which were not described in the research literature. This personal interest of mine about these pragmatic functions in combination with the lack of sufficient research on them in the then existing research literature was what informed greatly my initial PhD research proposal (Batziakas 2009), and in turn what led to this PhD thesis. Its scope and organisation is outlined in the next section, and its actual content is what follows subsequently.

1.2. Overview and organisation of the thesis

What follows this introductory Chapter 1 is divided into the following chapters: Chapter 2 begins with reviewing how the English language has turned from what once used to be a language spoken only in England, nowadays to the most widespread language in the world nowadays. It then looks at the implications of this spread with particular reference to the English language itself, as well as various issues regarding this spread. Subsequently, it discusses some of the terms and models which have been put forward to capture this spread of English around the world, as well as it explains why the

critique against them holds some weight. It then moves on to the paradigm of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). It first concerns with what led to its development as a term, and in doing so it shows in what sense it is different from the other models and terms. More importantly, it sides with the emerging body of work which sees ELF as able to provide an account of English as it is used nowadays as a contact and shared language between speakers from ethnolinguistically contexts around the world. Subsequently, Chapter 2 discusses various ELF-related studies and their findings, and in particular those ones which approached ELF from the perspective of wordings and pragmatics, around which this research study also revolves. It then finishes with what it believes to be important and useful to constitute research in ELF nowadays, and it puts forward the research questions which are answered in the subsequent analytical chapters.

Chapter 3 discusses some conceptual considerations by means of the theoretical framework within which this study was conducted. In particular, it looks at the fact that this study saw the variation in the linguistic exponents of non-native speakers of English not as ENL deficiency but as ELF difference, themselves not as ENL learners but as ELF users, and finally their interactions not as failed ENL discourse but as successful ELF communication.

Subsequently, it moves on to look at various key aspects regarding the overall research design and the data collection and analysis process. In doing so, it justifies why for the purposes of this study a naturalistic interpretive qualitative research approach was adopted. After that, it explains why particular elements

from the research traditions of ethnography and conversation analysis were found to be appropriate regarding the focus of this study, by means of combining the consideration of the wider context of the investigated interactions with a meticulous investigation of how the interactions were unfolding. Further to that, it describes how the data comprised naturally occurring spoken discourse from non-native international students at the University of London, who were meeting at that point in order to establish an international student society, using English as their lingua franca, as it was mentioned above. It also recounts how, in addition to this audio-recorded naturally occurring discourse from the students' meetings, notes which I was taking during these meetings and other notes of the students' linguistic practices outside these meetings which I or they were taking, as well as post-event semi-structured interviews with some of these students, were also found to be very important during the data analysis process.

Chapter 4 is the first analytical chapter. It starts with discussing the naturally occurring spoken discourse during the society meetings of the international students who participated in this study, aiming to discuss instances of translanguaging and their pragmatic significance while they were using English as their lingua franca. In particular, it discusses the way that the students were using language flexibly, that is, how they were making use of the entire gamut of their available linguistic resources by drawing extensively from them, and how they were thus achieving various communicative objectives. Speakers' flexible language use whereby they draw linguistic elements from various

linguistic resources which they have available has come to be known under various terms, and this chapter starts with a discussion of the most widely used of them, such as ‘code-switching’, ‘translanguaging’, and so on. It also justifies why the term ‘translanguaging’ was used instead of another one. Subsequently, it moves on to the translanguaging instances of the students in the investigated meetings. In doing so, the ensuing analysis of the data reveals that the students were thus achieving the pragmatic function ‘*making specific meaning*’, which appears in the title of this chapter, and which is broken down into the sub-functions ‘*filling in a lexical gap*’ and ‘*using some more precise lexis*’.

The following chapter, Chapter 5, is conceptually related to the previous one, but they both focus on different issues. As it was mentioned above, Chapter 4 discusses instances of translanguaging and their pragmatic significance, and in particular it looks at how the students of this study were drawing lexical items from all across their linguistic background and how they were thus making specific meaning. Chapter 5 also sets out to look at translanguaging instances in which the students were drawing lexis from all across their linguistic resources. However, it does so from the perspective of how they were achieving politeness in their discussions. Specifically, first, this chapter reviews some of the major politeness theories in sociolinguistics, as well as it discusses how politeness has been investigated in ELF research which looks at conversations between speakers from diverse sociocultural backgrounds. Then, building on these considerations, there follows an analysis of politeness in the extracts from the audio-recordings of the participants’ committee meetings. As it is yielded,

the overall pragmatic function of 'achieving politeness' was further broken down into two sub-functions. The first one is '*displaying discursive sensitivity through avoiding profanity in English*', and the second one is '*increasing politeness through showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background*'.

Chapter 6 discusses how the international students of this study were negotiating the meaning of culturally contested expressions, and in doing so how they were achieving various pragmatic functions related to attaining or retaining some kind of cultural appropriateness in their meetings. First, the construct of the negotiation of meaning is reviewed, and it is linked to the ability of language to adapt in order to suit the needs of the speakers who use it and the contexts in which it is used. In addition, there is a discussion of similar constructs, such as negotiation for meaning, and Negotiation with capital D. Subsequently, it is clarified that the particular focus of this chapter is on students' idiom variation and re-metaphorisation, that is, how students were proposing revisions of the meaning of the idiomatic expressions which they considered to be culturally contested and which they were setting out to refine or replace. In particular, drawing on the analysis of the data in this chapter, it is shown that two pragmatic functions were discerned. The first one is '*refining the culturally contested elements of an expression*', and the second one is '*replacing a culturally controversial expression altogether*'.

Chapter 7 is the next analytical chapter, and it is also conceptually related to the previous one. Chapter 7 looks at how the international students of this study

were managing the relational and building rapport in their meetings. Its aim was to investigate the pragmatic functions which were achieved when the students with the use of word play were revising various idiomatic expressions, either ENL ones or ones from their L1(s) or from other languages which they had some knowledge of, in order to establish or maintain some kind of better social relationships in their interactions. First, this chapter discusses the importance of the relational and rapport from the perspective of their contribution to social relationships in general. Then, it shows how the effort to manage the relational and to build rapport is an indispensable part of social interactions, and in particular what their role is in ELF-mediated conversations too. Against this backdrop, what follows is the analysis of the extracts with the expressions which the students were adapting for their purposes. Some insights are also drawn from the previous chapter, which discussed the phenomena of negotiation of meaning and idiom variation and re-metaphorisation. As it is shown, the students were thus achieving the pragmatic function of *'making an expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group'* and *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience'*.

Chapter 8 sets out to discuss the implications and applications of this research study. It reiterates that the first analytical question which was formulated for this research study has to do with the identification of wordings and other features of discourse which emerge in ELF-mediated ethnolinguistically diverse interactions, as well as their pragmatic significance. To answer this question, each of the four analytical chapters revolve around a variety of phrases and

expressions which were found to contribute to various pragmatic functions and sub-functions in the international students' interactions which were investigated here. This chapter sets out to answer the second research question, which calls for a discussion of the findings from the perspective of what they can reveal with regard to the competences, skills and practices which are necessary for successful communication in ELF-mediated interactions, and which are additional to the ones which have been already identified in the research literature. In particular, it revisits Hymes' concept of communicative competence as well as various related models of communicative competence and then various functional accounts of language use too. In doing so, it shows that the competences and particularly the skills related to specific functions and the sub-functions which were discerned here indeed add to the ones which were discerned so far in the research literature. In the same vein, it discusses the practice of translanguaging, which it sees as a corollary of the superdiversity of contemporary societies, and it explains that the particular instances of translanguaging which were identified here had not been previously identified in similar studies either. Last but not least, this chapter moves on to some pedagogical applications for ELT. In particular, it looks at the fields of English language planning and policy with regard to curriculum and syllabus design, coursebooks and materials development, teaching approaches and methods, and testing and assessment, and it argues that they have room for a more socially sensitive and sensible account which takes into consideration how English is used in lingua franca contexts.

Finally, Chapter 9 is the conclusion to this research study. Its purpose is to bring together the main topics and findings of the study, which were discussed above. In addition, it provides some sort of an overview regarding the key quality-related considerations which this research study attended to. Last but not least, it closes with some remarks which I think are important to be emphasised. In particular, it makes the point that there is the need to continue conducting ethnographically-based research, even in fields which could be regarded 'overarching' compared to applied linguistics and ELT, such as such sociolinguistics. This is because it is exactly a better and more socially sensitive and sensible account and understanding of the 'social' which is still missing from applied linguistics and ELT/TESOL, or at least which has not been explicated and has not been shed as much light as other areas in the field so far.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter starts with discussing how the spread of English from England to the rest of the world took place, and it identifies that the reasons behind it were initially the British colonialism and subsequently the might of the United States. It then moves on to look at some of the implications of this spread, such as the current global pre-eminence of English and the fact that English nowadays permeates many aspects of the everyday life of people around the world, as well as the English language variation and change. It then reviews some terms and models which were put forward and which attempted to capture this variation and change using various criteria each time, and it explains why such terms and models cannot be entirely valid nowadays. This being the case, it takes on board a viable and relatively recent alternative, the paradigm of English as Lingua Franca (ELF), which is currently gaining momentum and is being investigated with reference to a growing number of geographical and professional environments and other issues. In particular, as it adds, ELF wordings and pragmatics, which constitute the focus of this study, have been investigated with reference to the lexicogrammatical and other emerging innovations and which nevertheless do not hinder intelligibility, what processes bring them about, and the functions which they achieve in ELF interactions.

Taking all these into consideration, the last section of this chapter concludes with explaining that this research study sets out to investigate the ways that meaning is made in ELF interactions, from the perspective of how wordings and other features of discourse are used in ethnolinguistically diverse interactions and which pragmatic functions are thus achieved. In particular, it aims at shedding some more light on the competences, skills and practices which are discerned when speakers from diverse linguacultural backgrounds use English as their common and shared language in order to communicate.

2.2. From the spread of English to the worldliness of English

The spread of the English language started as a corollary of the expansion of the British territories throughout Britain's colonial history (Crystal 1997, 2004; Holliday 2004; McArthur 1987, 1998; McKay 2002), and it was later sustained due to the might of another world military, economic and cultural power which emerged and which also used it, the United States (Melchers and Shaw 2003). The international influence of these two superpowers went through various waxing and waning phases, but even nowadays English still keeps on spreading for other reasons and through other means. For instance, this is the case through globalisation (Block and Cameron 2003), as well as through the new technologies and the new and social media (Bruthiaux 2002), whereby it is employed to develop and maintain social relationships and cultural exchanges between an unprecedented number of people from all over the globe. Crystal

(2008) also acknowledges the importance of the spread of the English language both as a linguistic and sociolinguistic phenomenon, but he also notes that what is more important is not the historical reviews and explanations of the spread of English but the implications of this spread. In the same vein, Sweeney (2008), for instance, refers to the kudos of England due to the worldwide pre-eminence of its language (but see also Graddol 2006 on the waning fortunes of the NSs of English in the world), and Pinca (1995) elaborates on the financial revenues for England generated from the English language teaching and testing schemes throughout the world. However, for reasons of scope of this thesis, I would like to focus more on the implications which the spread of the English language has had for English itself.

It could be said that the most characteristic implication which the spread of the English language has had for English is encapsulated in the observations that nowadays "English is the global language" (Crystal 1997: 1, 2003:1).

Seidlhofer, Breiteneder and Pitzl (2006: 3) give the following description of the worldwide presence of the English language nowadays:

English impinges on everybody's life... in many different ways: people watch CNN and MTV, they attend English classes; they encounter commercial slogans such as the "The Real Thing" and "I'm lovin' it", hip hoppers as well as bank executives use English in their (very different) everyday activities, companies choose English for international communication, tourists ask and are given directions in English, and so on.

Indeed, as Prodromou (1997: 19) puts it, “[t]here is a world of difference between English and, in fact, all the other living languages at present”. English has spread beyond the educated elites and it can be now considered as the de facto language which people employ in order to establish and maintain social relationships across national borders, ethnic groups and cultural spheres. Also, this takes place in a great variety of domains, such as the internet (Korpela 2003), the media (Durant and Lambrou 2009), broadcasting (Crisell 2002), show business (Bright 2000), advertisements (Gerritsen et al. 2006), technology (Hanchey 2008), medicine (Glendinning and Holmström 2005), popular youth culture and music (Pennycook and Alim 2007), work places (Kapur and McHale 2005) and everyday life in general (Belcher 2006). Another important role of English nowadays is that it is employed in instances where some kind of common ground has to be found or created on a political level. For instance, Labrie and Quell (1997), Preisler (1999) and Truchot (1997, 2002, 2003) observe that such is the case in the current effort to boost regional integration and to maximise movement across the European borders. In addition, a large number of companies adopt English names in their attempt to reach a larger consumer base, not only because English is needed for some kind of communication, but also because English is nowadays associated with some kind of progress and development. For instance, Melchers and Shaw (2003) report that more than 80 per cent of the apparel shops on the high streets of Stockholm have English names, and they suggest that most likely this is because English names make such shops sound more international and trendy.

Furthermore, in education, gaining proficiency in English is put forward as an important pronouncement in the vast majority of the curricula around the world (Gnutzmann and Intemann 2005). In particular, it has been found that English holds a vital role in the curriculum of many European countries from primary education onwards (Wastiau-Schlüter 2005), where it is “a basic skill taught in elementary school alongside computer skills”, as Graddol notes (2004: 1330). English is also the main mandatory or chosen additional or second language which students choose or their third language (Cenoz and Jessner 2000), it is also increasingly being employed as the language of instruction in Content and Language Integration Learning (CLIL) curricula (Hoffmann 2000), and in general it is estimated that around 90 percent of the pupils across Europe study English at some point of their school life (Pilos 2005). Teaching of courses exclusively in English is also becoming more and more common at tertiary education (Murray and Dingwall 2001). Up to a point, it could be argued, the Bologna Process played some role in that, as it called for an organisation of the higher education systems in a way that would facilitate the exchange of students and academics and the dissemination of ideas. Such an organisation, then, necessarily makes more and more institutions and people use English (ibid.). Likewise, English is a necessary tool in the domain of scientific research, both because the scientific journals use English to aim at an international and thus larger readership and also because this readership will in turn use English in order to maximise access of information and publication of their articles (Viereck 1996). In particular, the vast majority of the scientific associations in Europe embrace English as their main or indeed as their sole language for their meetings and the

circulation of their documents (Ammon 1994, 2001; Ammon and McConnell 2002).

It is also worth mentioning that even the European Union, the most influential institution of Europe, which generally presents itself as pursuing equally everyone's linguistic rights in that it argues to value equally all its member-states and their languages, in fact employs English more than any other language. Tosi (2003, 2005) argues that the official policy is discarded in order to ease the working process in general, and in particular Breidbach (2003) observes that English is used as the *de facto* mediator of communication in order to rely less on a third party or on translations which would be both costly and time-consuming. English is indeed chosen for drafting around 60 per cent of the paperwork of the EU agencies and funds despite the fact that there are 20 official languages (Owen 2005). Similarly, both the external and the internal communication of the European Central Bank takes place only in English (van Els 2005). On a similar note, English is also adopted as the working language of many other international bodies and organisations, such as the UN and NATO (Dollerup 1996). In the same vein, far away from Europe and the Western world, Kirkpatrick (2008, 2009, 2010) also discusses the fact that English is now not only the *de facto* but also the *de jure* single official and working language of the 10 countries which make up the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

The means of the spread of English around the world, the large number of people who use it and the multitude of domains in which it is used have led to various kinds of reactions and responses. Phillipson situates the discussion in a wide political framework and takes issue both with the systematic agendas to promote English and with the status of English nowadays, and talks of linguistic imperialism (1992, 2007, 2008, 2009). This is further linked to discussions about linguicism (Skutnab-Kangas and Phillipson 1998). Canagarajah (1999) adopts a similar standpoint, but he also proposes strategies which English language users can employ in order to resist this kind of linguistic imperialism, such as using English meshed through elements from their own linguistic background (see more on this in Chapter 4). In a similar vein, Pennycook (1994) discusses the current political and economic situation, and he argues that it is the forces of neoliberalism and capitalism which currently continue to spread English. However, it should also be noted that others feel favourably towards the spread of English, and they acknowledge what English has to offer nowadays. For instance, Crystal (1997) refers to the South African black writer Harry Mashabela, who as early as 1975 writes that English not only enables people to engage in social relations with others who may live and work far away but also provides everyone with a unifying cord, in so far as it boosts familiarity with other ethnic and racial groups and thus it also goes some way towards dissolving negative stereotypes and prejudices. Similarly, Gimenez (2001) argues that the English language is nowadays shared by so many people around the globe that even a sense of planetary togetherness is brought about, thanks to the fact that many people use English as the main and sometimes as

the only means to communicate with one another, to exchange ideas, to travel, to build friendships and other social relationships. The spread of English has also spawned discussions not from the perspective of its advantages and disadvantages as a sociolinguistic phenomenon, but as a wider socio-political phenomenon, for instance, from the perspective of its contribution to and its implications for the socio-political situation in particular contexts, such as Africa (e.g. Achebe 1988, Ngũgĩ 1986).

The purpose of looking at the above views on the spread of English is neither to appraise them nor to take any stance regarding them or to reach any conclusion. It is because the views of the users of English on the spread of the language, it could be argued, also play a role in the way that English is used. And, in turn, the way English is used also seems to play some role in the way that English varies and changes over time. Indeed, in recent work on the variation and change of the English language, the interplay between various socio-political and linguistic forces has come to the fore. For instance, Mufwene (2001) argues that in contexts in which more than one language is at work forces may be exerted by many factors. These factors may include the power distributions and the social relationships between the language users in an interaction, their demographic characteristics, the amount and the types of their contact, the intensity and the frequency of their contact, the degree of typological similarities and dissimilarities of their mother tongues, as well as they may include the language users' views on the language which they use to communicate, in this case, English. Similarly, Van Rooy (2010) argues that,

alongside language-internal factors, social dynamics and factors such as the status and the identity of the speakers who use English are of paramount importance.

In the same vein, Widdowson (2010) explains that it is not the English language which comes into contact with other languages but the individual users of the English language. What he means is that the entire gamut of relations including human relations of the people as well as their views on English should be taken into consideration in any discussion regarding variation and change in the English language. At the same time, as it is explained within the framework of communication accommodation theory (e.g. Giles 1984), language users tend to unconsciously pick up some of the linguistic features of their interlocutors, thus lessening their differences, and in turn they end up widening the set of features which they have in common. These features can include but are not limited to features of accent and prosody, features of lexicogrammar, style, and even paralinguistic features used when interacting with others. As they argue, the entailing result of this convergence then is even more variation and change in the way that the English language comes to be used around the world.

The processes of language variation and change discussed above are of course not the only ones. However, with reference to the variation and change of the English language in particular, since English is nowadays employed by so many users and is used in so many domains, as shown above, they are still enough to account for the way that “English... disperses in different forms, a

myriad of Englishes”, as Widdowson characteristically puts it (1994: 378). For Widdowson (*ibid.*), this is logical as well as it is acceptable, since language is by nature supposed to be changing in order to suit the needs of its users and the communicative situations in which it is used. This being the sociolinguistic reality with regard to the English language, then, Widdowson further argues that there is the need to problematise and complexify the notion of the native speakers of the English language, as well as in turn the need to acknowledge the rightful agency of the non-native speakers of English (for similar arguments also see Leung, Harris and Rampton 1997 and Rampton 1990). As he writes:

How English develops in the world is no business whatever of native speakers in England or anywhere else. They have no say in the matter, no right to intervene or pass judgment. They are irrelevant. The very fact that English is an international language means that no nation can have custody over it (p. 384).

The variation and change in the pronunciation, grammar, lexis, and discourse of English as it is now manifested in many contexts and in many countries around the world has been the subject of many studies (see e.g. Aitchison 1991; Jenkins 2003, 2009; Kirkpatrick 2007; Platt, Weber and Ho 1984; Sebba 1997; Todd 1990; Trudgill and Hannah 1994, 2002), although it should be added that some of these studies do not adopt the same perspective and they do not conceptualise the international use of English in the same way. This state of affairs with the spread of English around the world and with all these emerging and innovative variants is what a large number of terms and models have attempted to capture. Below, I discuss the most widely known of them. Then, I

also show why and in what regards these terms and models do not entirely do justice to the latest developments of English around the world and its current role as the language which is most likely to be used for communication by the vast majority of the speakers who come from different linguacultural backgrounds. This will serve as the backdrop against which the paradigm of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) will be later discussed as a worthwhile alternative, since it is within this paradigm that my research takes place, and the research questions of this study will be subsequently formulated.

2.3. Terms and models of English in the world

As early as 1970, Strang put forward three terms, which meant to be extensively used ever since. 'English as a native language' (ENL) was the first one of them, to refer to the English of speakers who are born and raised in countries in which English is the first language, such as the UK, the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. 'English as a second language' (ESL) to refer to the English which is officially used in public documents and so on, usually in countries which were colonised by the British, such as India and Pakistan, along with any local languages or language varieties or dialects which were spoken there before. Finally, 'English as a foreign language' (EFL) to refer to the English of the speakers of all the other countries, such as Greece, China, and so on. In other words, 'English as foreign language' refers to the English of those speakers who live in countries in which English is neither the first spoken

language nor is it officially used along with any local languages or language varieties or dialects, but it is learned mainly through formal education in public or state schools or private institutions.

However, conceptualising English around the world through the scope of the terms 'ENL', 'ESL' and 'EFL' has a number of difficulties. For instance, even Quirk, who in 1985 talks favourably about these terms of English as a more scrutinised way to look at what English is or rather what English is used for and learned as around the world, in 1988 he casts doubt on them. He now admits that it is not always possible to equate settings with users, nor to draw solid lines between some English users in particular settings and others in other settings. Building on these limitations of the aforementioned terms, McArthur (1998) also brings forward some more interrelated concerns. As he argues, 'ENL' cannot denote any single one variety of English, as English differs in many aspects from one country to another, and even from one region to another within the same country, even if it is spoken as a native language. Likewise, it also differs from one individual speaker to another, according to their education and so many other factors. He also notes that English-based pidgins and creoles, some of which are also so different from the native dialects and varieties of English that can even be taken for different languages altogether, have a lot of native speakers in parts of the world such as the Caribbean. They are also used as second languages in territories such as West Africa, and as foreign languages in countries such as Panama and Nicaragua in the Americas. McArthur also observes that there are nowadays large groups of

ENL speakers who live in some ESL countries, such as India, as a result of reasons which may span from colonisation in the past to extended touristic stays at present times, and large numbers of ESL and EFL speakers who live in many ENL countries, such as the USA and the UK, as a result of immigration or studies. Finally, he also refers to the growing number of the multi- and bilingual people nowadays. As he explains, the English which the speakers above use cannot be always assigned to any single one category out of the three of 'ENL', 'ESL' and 'EFL'.

In addition to the terms 'ENL', 'ESL', 'EFL', there have also been proposed terms such as 'English as an International Auxiliary Language' (Smith 1976) 'English as an International Language' (Smith 1983), 'International English' (Trudgill and Hanna 1985), 'English as a Medium of Intercultural Communication' (Meierkord 1996), 'World Standard English' and 'World Standard Spoken English' (Crystal 1995, 2003), 'English as a Global Language' (Crystal 1997, 2004) and 'English as a World Language' (Mair 2003 and Nunan 1999/2000), to name just a few. What all these additions to 'English' have in common is that they all point to the need to move beyond the firm association of English only with its place of origin and its native speakers, and in turn to signal as its most characteristic feature nowadays its special status around the world as the preferred option for communication among people from different linguistic backgrounds, examples of which were provided in the previous sections.

However, as many scholars argue (see e.g. Jenkins 2003, 2009; Kirkpatrick 2007; Murata and Jenkins 2009; Seidlhofer 2004, 2006), these terms essentially

talk about English as if English is a specific and tangible linguistic entity which is or should be monolithically distributed and appropriated from the various speakers who use it around the world. Likewise, these terms also seem to suggest the need for an international standard for English to exist, so that the people around the world who would like to use it would have some kind of reference according to which English language teaching and learning could be organised or some kind of yardstick against which their English language development could be measured. Thus, these terms are not very nuanced with regard to the variation and change regarding all these ways that users use English and all these contexts in which English is nowadays used. In particular, as Seidlhofer puts it when she refers to these terms and in particular to how they are often interchangeably used just to refer to 'International English', "[this view] is misleading in that it suggests that there is one clearly distinguishable, codified, and unitary variety called *International English*, which is certainly not the case" (2004: 210, italics in the original).

There have also been various attempts to provide an account of the spread of English not by proposing a term but by trying to capture this spread in a diagrammatic model (see e.g. the diagrammatic models of Canagarajah 2008; Görlach 1988; Graddol 2006; Kachru 1985, 1988; McArthur 1987; Modiano 1999a, b; Strevens 1980; Tripathi 1998, Yano 2007). As in the case of the terms above, these models were put forward having different priorities and using different criteria. For instance, Strevens's tree-like world map of English (1980) identifies the UK as the birthplace of English and as giving what he calls the

‘British English Branch’, which then branches out towards the West and gives the ‘American English Branch’, which in turn branches out and gives many other branches of English in the continent. In the same way, towards the East, it gives the English branches of Africa, Far East, and Australasia, which in turn branch out and give many other branches in their respective regions.

Quite differently, in the model which may be considered to be the most often cited one out of all these models mentioned above, Kachru’s model (1985, 1988), three concentric circles are identified, the so-called Inner, Outer and Expanding Circle, and they seem to rather correspond to the terms ‘ENL’, ‘ESL’, ‘EFL’, which were discussed above. In particular, the Inner Circle includes all these countries in which English is supposed to be spoken as a Native Language (ENL), the Outer Circle includes all the countries in which English is used as a Second Language (ESL), and the Expanding Circle includes the countries in which English is taught and learned as a Foreign Language (EFL).

In what seems to be an attempt to refine Kachru’s model, Modiano’s model (1999a) comprises two circles. The first one is an inner circle which includes the English speakers who are “proficient in international English”, no matter whether they have reached “native or foreign language proficiency”, and the second one is an outer circle which includes what he calls “learners”. In a subsequent attempt to refine his previous model, Modiano (1999b) puts forward a similar model which however has two differences. The first one is that its inner circle does not include any group of English language speakers, as his previous

model did, but the English language variety which they speak and this is the “English as an International Language” (‘EIL’). The second difference is that the outer circle does not include any group of “learners”, which was the case in his previous model, but various flower-like petals and each of them respectively includes the widely known varieties of “British English” and “American English”, other major varieties such as “Canadian English” and “Australian English”, while there is also a ‘petal’ for all the other “foreign language speakers”.

In the same vein, Kachru (2004) put forward an updated model in an attempt to refine his previous one (1985). In his updated model, the Inner Circle is kept at the core, but there is no reference made to any particular geographical context, such as the UK or the USA, which was the case in his previous model. Instead, now, there is reference to speakers with “high proficiency” in English, without any specification whether these high proficient speakers are native speakers or non-native speakers of English. Also, the former Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle have now merged and they encompass all these speakers who have “low proficiency” in English. Again, there is no reference to whether these low proficient speakers are native or non-native English speakers.

However, all these models have various limitations. For instance, Streven’s tree-like world map of English (ibid.), with its clearly cut and distinct branches and sub-branches and even more sub-branches of English around the world, cannot do justice to the sociolinguistic reality with regard to the people who use English and the contexts in which English is nowadays used. In that map, each

branch of English is supposed to correspond to a particular country or region of the world, such as the “British English” which corresponds to the UK and the “American English” which corresponds to the USA. However, the sociolinguistic reality of English nowadays is much more complex. This complexity may be understood by considering the fact that no country or region of the world can nowadays feature or exhibit only one variety of English, in so far as people immigrate, travel, study abroad, and so on, and thus they bring along their English wherever they found themselves.

The same applies even to Kachru’s concentric circles model (*ibid.*), which has been the most influential of all of them, as it was mentioned above. The three concentric circles of this model are territorially defined, that is, they try to associate different groups of countries or regions of the world with different varieties of English. As such, this model does not take into consideration the fact that it is not a group of countries or regions around the world which can bear and exhibit English in its own right, but rather it is the individual users who employ English in order to serve their needs each time. Also, it does not take into account either that nowadays English is employed for communication between speakers not only within these circles but also across them. This model also implies that the situation is the same in all the countries or regions of a particular circle, whereas the reality is different, in so far as all language interactions and contexts are dynamic and fluid. In that model, there are also clear boundaries between the Inner and the Outer Circle, whereas in reality English in some Outer Circle countries may be learned as a first language at

home in case that this is the language which the parents of a child use, without this being the official language of the country or the region in which they live. On the same note, in that model, there are clear boundaries between the Outer and the Expanding Circle, whereas the reality is again different. This is so, because many countries, such as Switzerland and Denmark, are currently in transition regarding the status of English, from what would be previously characterised as 'EFL' to what can be now aspired to be changing into 'ESL' (for further discussions on the limitations of Kachru's model, see e.g. Jenkins 2003, 2009; Kirkpatrick 2007; Pennycook 2007, 2009; Schneider 2007 and Seidlhofer 2002).

On the other hand, Modiano's models (*ibid.*) does not sufficiently explain the linguistic features of what he calls "International English". In turn, he does not explain what the knowledge and the skills of an English language speaker who is "proficient in International English" are, or when and how an English "learner" becomes "proficient in International English". Modiano's models also seem to suggest that all the varieties of English which he mentions, such as "British English" and "American English", share the same linguistic features. Thus, he does not consider the great variation depending on factors which may include the speaker's educational background, their personal style regarding their language use, their accommodation practices while they interact with other speakers, and so on.

Likewise, in Kachru's revised model (*ibid.*), there is no clarification or explication regarding the linguistic knowledge and skills of the speakers who can show

“high proficiency” and “low proficiency” in English, and when or how a low proficiency speaker can become a high proficiency one. Also, it has not taken into consideration the variation which is exhibited in the way that the speakers use the English language around the world due to the factors which contribute to the varying usage and use, as it was mentioned above. Thus, although this revised model admittedly managed to unlock particular features of English language and use from particular geographical settings, it also brought to the fore different issues. After all, one should not forget that all the models discussed above are attempts to do justice to as highly dynamic and fluid phenomena as the usage and the use of the English language by many language users and in many contexts of use around the world, and thus this complexity is impossible to be captured in any kind of diagram or map or any other representation of this sort anyway (Bruthiaux 2003, Kandiah 1998, Mesthrie 2008, Toolan 1997).

I discussed in this section some of the terms and models which have been proposed as an attempt to capture the spread of English around the world and in particular the way that English is variably used nowadays, and then I explained why they rather fall short of doing justice to this sociolinguistic reality with regard to the speakers who currently use English and the contexts in which English is used. Taking into consideration all the above, is there an alternative which is able to account for all this fluid and dynamic sociolinguistic phenomenon of the spread of English? Jenkins gave the answer by putting forward the paradigm of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), first in an IATEFL

presentation in 1996 and later on in her seminal book in 2000. In the next section, the underlying tenets of ELF are discussed and it is thus suggested that ELF can constitute a sufficient framework to set out to describe the complexity regarding the spread of English and the multifarious implications of it. Subsequently, the major themes in ELF studies are provided, and then ELF wordings are looked at and in particular there is focus on how they have been found to contribute to the achievement of various pragmatic functions in communication between speakers from different linguacultural backgrounds. Doing so, it will make more sense to discuss what I see as issues which are worth exploring in the field, and at the same time they are under-investigated ones. In turn, which research questions were raised and tried to be answered in this thesis in order to attend to these issues will be presented too.

2.4. The paradigm of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

2.4.1. The underlying tenets of ELF

ELF represents a significant conceptual shift and it provides a much more sociolinguistically sensitive and sensible account of the way that English is nowadays spread and variably used around the world. Indeed, the conceptual advantages of the term 'ELF' are many and immediate. For instance, as Jenkins (2000) argues, 'ELF' emphasises the fact that the primary role of English nowadays is its de facto choice in communication between speakers from

different linguacultural backgrounds. ELF also accepts the fact that language 'mixing' is acceptable, since after all this is how the original lingua francas used to come into existence since time immemorial. It also suggests that there is nothing inherently wrong with the speakers who retain certain features of their linguacultural backgrounds, even when they use English to communicate with other speakers. In this sense, as she explains,

English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) refers to the English that is used as a contact language among speakers who come from different first language and cultural backgrounds (p. 9).

It is important to stress here that the definition above does not conceptualise ELF as being itself a distinctive and tangible language or another dialect or variety of English. It just highlights the fact that English functions as a contact and common language which is used for communication between speakers who come from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. This is exactly the function which Greek or Latin and Sabir used to have along the South-Eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea in the past, as well as the function which other languages or language dialects and varieties had elsewhere around the world (see also Jenkins 2004, 2005). The emphasis on the functional role of ELF as a common and shared language for communication rather than as a language whose formal features can be pinned down and described is also highlighted in the following definition of ELF:

ELF is thus defined *functionally* by its use in intercultural communication rather than *formally* (Hülmbauer, Böhringer and Seidlhofer 2008:27, italics in the original).

It is also useful to clarify that the above definition and description of ELF are going to be used in this study. And it is important to clarify this, because ELF differs fundamentally from the way that various scholars have approached the international use of English in general. For instance, Firth (1990, 1996) adopts a learner perspective and is interested in showing how learners of English can successfully communicate in lingua franca settings despite any ‘deficiency’ which they may be seen as having, such as despite their lack of mastery of linguistic idiomaticity, whereas ELF interactions are investigated in their own right and not by taking ENL as a benchmark for language proficiency. In the same vein, other scholars, such as Meierkord (1996) and House (1999, 2002), focus exclusively on the discourse among non-native speakers of English, although it is acknowledged that ELF-mediated interactions may take place both with and without the presence of native speakers of English.

The eligibility of ELF as a distinct and tangible variety of the English language seems to be a recurrent topic of discussion, all the more so because the traditional nomenclature and the interest of sociolinguistics and in particular of variationist sociolinguistics does not sit comfortably with the case of ELF, as Seidlhofer (2006) and Mauranen (2009) show. Indeed, traditionally, linguistic variants were used to demarcate distinct speech communities and therein to delineate distinct language varieties. Thus, there was a focus on how language

differs between groups of people according to certain social categories of their, e.g. level of education, age, gender, ethnicity, and so on, and in turn how the observed linguistic variants were associated with these social categories. In other words, the set of the language features of the speakers of each of these categories was considered to form a distinct language variety and the speakers who spoke it were considered to belong to a distinct speech community (cf. e.g. Labov 1963, 1972). There have also been studies which focused on smaller communities and which aimed at discovering salient local social categories (e.g. Gal 1979, Holmquist 1985), and studies whose predominant focus was the personal language stylistic practices of the interlocutors (e.g. Eckert 2003, and cf. Eckert 2005 for the dissection of linguistic variation studies in what she sees as three loosely-coming waves). Still, even nowadays, linguistic variants rather remain predominantly an interpretation of speakers' membership in particular social categories, and a demarcation of different language varieties of different social groups.

This being the case, terms such as 'speech community' and 'language variety' cannot hold much weight with reference to ELF contexts in the current sociolinguistic reality, and there have been indeed various lines of argument showing that ELF users cannot be regarded as a particular speech community, and in turn ELF does not constitute a language variety in the conventional sense. For instance, Seidlhofer (2004) discusses various lexicogrammatical features across many first languages and their domains of use, from the perspective of whether ELF can be seen as a variety in its own right. Her

conclusion is that ELF cannot be seen as a distinct variety of English but as “a distinct manifestation of English” (p. 230). In the same vein, Leung (2005) draws his argument from many interrelated discussions, such as from the emergence of a ‘third culture’ or ‘interculture’ in interactions between English language users from different linguacultural backgrounds (cf. Meierkord 2002) and the decoupling of English from its initial geographic context (cf. Widdowson 2003). In doing so, he shows that all these can problematise the immediate link between being a native speaker of English and having a ‘complete’ knowledge of English. In turn, with regard to the status of ELF as a distinct variety of English, Leung concludes that all these surely point to the need to recognise emerging varieties of English, but he also adds that “the research in this area is pointing to the need for ELF to be treated as *sui generis*” (p. 136, italics in the original).

On the same note, although Seidlhofer, Breiteneder and Pitzl (2006) focus on ELF interaction in Europe only, their discussion is relevant to ELF research in the rest of the world too. They explicitly mention that they set out to address the terminological issue of whether ELF constitutes a variety of English, and for that matter they observe that the analytic and descriptive approaches and categories which have evolved through work in communities of native speakers and on relatively stable codes therein are not appropriate in the case of ELF. They observe that this is not only because in some contexts English is nowadays considerably decoupled from its native speakers but also because ELF can vary for other reasons too. For instance, they mention cases in which

English may show some degrees of 'local colour', such as in the case of many local TV newscasters around Europe, as well as they also refer to the very striking case of the editors of an anarchistic newspaper that decided to use 'bad English' in order to express their denial of the authority of every established norm including what it would be traditionally considered proper and correct Standard English. Thus, they reach the conclusion that "we cannot just conceive of the monolithic English" (p. 7).

Seidlhofer (2007) and Dewey (2009a) also support the argument that ELF does not constitute a variety of English, by providing evidence from linguistic interactions which relate to the advent of digital communication, such as emails and chat- and video-conferencing. As they explain, all these afford people to study on online learning environments, access and share information on electronic encyclopaedias and other websites, trade and purchase on online stores and auctions, and even meet and get to know others on chat rooms and other social networking sites (also see e.g. Guest 2007 for more examples). These, then, constitute some kind of virtual communities, and thus they differ widely from the local speech communities. In addition, with regard to language production and reception, in the face-to-face interaction in local speech communities, interlocutors have access to the intended meaning not only thanks to the spoken word but also through prosodic features, actions and realia. On the other hand, in digital communication, understanding is not so readily achieved, in so far as all these may be lacking. In addition, in virtual environments, people can even individually, anonymously and ephemerally log

on and participate from all over the world, which is less so or perhaps not at all the case with interactions which take place face to face. In addition, the fact that in all the above contexts of communication English is nowadays employed as the default lingua franca means that there is an intersection of the traditional local categories, boundaries and borders. It also means that the interactants in these environments bear and enact a wide variety of elements from their linguistic, social, and cultural backgrounds while they use English as their common and shared language to communicate. This is why Seidlhofer refers to these contexts of unbounded communication as ‘communities of practice’ (cf. Lave and Wenger 1991, 1998, etc), as this term seems to represent the linguistic practices with reference to English use better than the territorially defined term of ‘speech communities’.

In a similar vein, Dewey (2009a) adduces arguments from Pennycook’s (2006) description of how different forms of English are interconnected with what he calls ‘transcultural flows’ around the world, and of the way in which these are embedded in disparate contexts. He also brings into his discussion Jenk’s (2003) account of how English nowadays ‘transgresses’ the global and the local in the contemporary world. Finally, he also draws from Butler’s (1997) arguments against the essentialised categories and norms of culture and identity, and in turn in favour of a broader understanding of people as social agents in line with the notion of ‘performativity’. And what Dewey reiterates is the fact that ELF is increasingly and distinctively emerging in its own right (cf Leung’s *ibid.* characterisation of ELF as *sui generis*), in so far as both the notion

of a particular 'speech community' is too static and the term 'linguistic variety' is too stable to do justice to ELF as a sociolinguistic phenomenon as well as to capture its fluid, dynamic and complex nature of its contemporary usage and use.

2.4.2. Major themes in ELF studies

When the term 'ELF' was still in the early stages after its inception, Jenkins (2000) wondered whether it would eventually catch on. Ever since, not only has the term 'ELF' caught on, but it could be safely said that it has become a rich and diverse research paradigm. A piece of evidence which testifies to this is the large number of scholars who have researched and are still researching ELF from a linguistic point of view, such as phonetics and phonology (e.g. Jenkins 2000), lexicogrammar (e.g. Seidlhofer 2004), pragmatics (e.g. Cogo 2007; Cogo and Dewey 2006, 2012; Dewey 2007), and so on. Another piece of evidence is the large number of scholars around the world who have not only looked at various linguistic issues regarding ELF but have also done so with reference to a great variety of contexts and settings. To mention just a few, these include specific countries such as China (Wang 2013), Greece (Batziakas 2008, Sifakis, Lytra and Fray 2010) and Turkey (Bayurt 2009), special administrative regions such as Hong Kong (Sung 2012), wider regions such as Scandinavia (Björkman 2009) and the Gulf (Zoghbor 2009), or whole continents such as Asia (Kirkpatrick 2008) and Europe (Jenkins, Modiano and Seidlhofer 2001). Other studies on ELF have also focussed on its role in various professional contexts,

settings and domains, such as academia (Mauranen 2007), the news (Bondi and Poppi 2008), websites (Aaltonen 2006), tourism (Goncalves 2009) and air traffic control (Oda 2008), or its role in the life of particular professional groups such as businesspeople (Ehrenreich 2008, Wolfartsberger 2011) and jurists (Maschio 2008).

ELF is also looked at from the perspective of its relationship with many issues which are extra-linguistic but of course are still language-related. For instance, ELF is critically reviewed from the perspective of whether it contributes to linguistic imperialism (Philippson 2008), and it is discussed from the perspective of its similarities and differences with other closely related research paradigms such as World Englishes (WE) (Pakir 2009 and Seidlhofer 2009c). Also, the focus in some other ELF-related studies is on how ELF can inform and update English language pedagogy from the perspective of the pedagogic model which should be nowadays aimed at (Jenkins 2000, 2002; Walker 2010), with reference to the communicative competence in general (Leung 2005, 2013), with relevance to testing (Jenkins 2006a), with regard to students' motivation (Kaloscai 2009), as regards students' learning environments (Smit 2009), regarding teacher education (Dewey 2009b), or in the wider field of how it relates to English language speakers' identity, perceptions and attitudes both about themselves as English language speakers and about the English language itself (Jenkins 2007).

The ELF-related studies mentioned above surely testify to the vitality of the field, while at the same time they contribute extensively to raising awareness on various conceptual and ideological issues around ELF in general, as well as with reference to the role of ELF in specific geographical and professional contexts. In addition, with relevance to this study, their significance lies in the fact that they serve as a good background regarding the linguistic and social interactions in which English is used as a lingua franca, from the perspective of showing the role of various linguistic features, such as grammatical forms, lexis, intonation, and so on, in all these multifarious communicative interactions. Among these linguistic features there are wordings too, which is the focus of this study. Thus, in the subsequent section, I provide the take of this study on wordings and then I continue with an elaboration on ELF wordings from the perspective of their significance regarding the pragmatic functions which they help to achieve when interlocutors from different linguacultural backgrounds use English as their common language of communication. This is so, because it is exactly this particular niche which led to the research questions which this study formulated and set out to answer, as it will be shown below.

2.4.3. ELF wordings and pragmatics

Wordings can be thought of as a generic term encompassing lexis and other elements, such as phrases and expressions. Thus, one could say that they could be associated with the term 'lexicogrammar', which Halliday (1961) put forward in his Systemic Functional Linguistic Theory (SFLT) drawing on earlier

work of the 'London School of Linguistics' (e.g. Firth 1957). In this frame, the lexicogrammar of ELF was one of the first key aspects of ELF which was investigated. Its focus can be seen as having started with work on systematically recording and analysing the linguistic properties of ELF talk with the idea to spot and report on characteristic ELF lexicogrammatical features. This research was greatly facilitated by two one-million word corpora. The first one was the 'Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English' ('VOICE'), a collaborative project between the University of Vienna and Oxford University Press. This consisted of mainly face-to-face spoken interactions, which included speech events that varied from one-to-one interviews to private and public dialogues to private and public casual conversations or group discussions. The participants in those interactions were non-native speakers of English who came from a wide range of first language backgrounds and whose primary and secondary education and socialisation took place in a language other than English. The second one was the University of Helsinki's corpus of English as a Lingua Franca, which was divided into two subcorpora: the 'English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings Corpus' ('ELFA Corpus'), which focused on English as a lingua franca in academic contexts, and the 'Studying in English as a Lingua Franca Corpus' ('SELF Corpus'), which searched for interactive and adaptive processes from the users' viewpoint. Recently, two new corpora were also initiated: one is the corpus 'Tübingen English as a Lingua Franca' ('TELF') at the Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen, and the other is the corpus 'English as a Lingua Franca in Asia' ('ELFIA') at the Hong Kong Institute of Education.

All these corpora provided the affordance for the study of ELF on a large scale, and as a result a number of features constituting systematic differences between ELF and NS English have been already identified. These differences do not seem to be part of NS English but emerge in ELF interactions only, and in that sense they are deemed to be innovative. Seidlhofer (2004: 220) reports the following: dropping the third person present tense -s; confusing the relative pronouns *who* and *which* (e.g. *a person which...* and *a book who...*); omitting definite and indefinite articles where they are obligatory in ENL and inserting them where they do not occur in ENL (e.g. *the part two*); not using the standard forms in tag questions (e.g. *isn't it?* or *no?* instead of *shouldn't they?*); inserting prepositions which are redundant in ENL (e.g. *we have to study about...*); overusing certain verbs of high semantic generality (e.g. *do, have, make, put, take*), replacing infinitive-constructions with *that*-clauses (e.g. *I want that...*); and overdoing explicitness (e.g. *black color* rather than just *black*). To these lexicogrammatical features, Ranta (2010) adds the progressive aspect even in stative verbs as well as in verbs in sentences expressing habitual activities (e.g. *he's going to work every day*); *would* in the hypothetical *if*-clauses of the 1st and the 2nd conditional (e.g. *if he would go, you can join him*); and embedded inversions in *wh*- (e.g. *he asked her what time is it*) and *yes/no* questions (e.g. *he asked her whether is she a student*).

As mentioned above, those features were discerned and reported in order to show what is generally characteristic in ELF lexicogrammar. Other features, however, were look at lexicogrammar with a focus on particular issues around

them. For instance, Breiteneder (2005) focuses particularly on ELF speakers' tendency to exploit redundancy with regard to dropping the third person singular-s, and in turn she discusses the 'naturalness' of ELF as a sociolinguistic phenomenon. Ranta (2006) investigates ELF speakers' tendency to extend the *-ing* morpheme of the present progressive tense, making a plea for this to be recognised as serving different functions in lingua franca contexts. Elsewhere, Ranta (2009) focuses on various lexicogrammatical forms, and in particular on how they are syntactically used and how they are parallel to other native and non-native varieties of English, also wondering which features may be more universally emerging in other ELF interactions. Hülmbauer (2007) elaborates on the relationship between communicative effectiveness and lexicogrammatical conformity to ENL norms, highlighting the fact that the former can be achieved even without the latter, and showing that expressions which would be characterised as incorrect in Standard English can nevertheless work in ELF interactions. Finally, with idiomaticity being the focus of their attention, Seidlhofer and Widdowson (2007) show that ELF speakers tend to create and negotiate idiomatic wordings in a joint way while they are interacting, rather than to use idiomatic expressions which have been established in advance and which may hinder the interlocutors' mutual understanding because they are not familiar with these idiomatic expressions.

At this point, it is worth reiterating that the lexicogrammatical forms in ELF interactions are readily visible and tangible, and thus they are also easy to discern and report, all the more so when research is conducted electronically in

a corpus. However, it is worth remembering an observation which was presented above, that “ELF is defined *functionally* by its use in intercultural communication” (Hülmbauer, Böhringer and Seidlhofer 2008: 27, italics in the original). In the same vein, as Seidlhofer (2009a: 40) puts it,

it is the functional significance of forms that is of primary interest and should therefore be central to our enquiry into any kind of communication through language.

What this means is that the primary focus of investigation of the ELF lexicogrammar and wordings too should not be on the innovative forms themselves, but on the understanding of their pragmatic significance in ELF communication. In turn, for that matter, there is the need not for a structural and forms-based perspective but for a pragmatics-oriented one. Such a perspective has started being adopted by more and more ELF studies (see e.g. the papers in Mauranen and Ranta 2009). And it is useful to discuss some of the most often cited ones here, as what has been left under-researched will lead to the research questions of this study, as it will be shown below. To begin with, attempts have been made to look at what motivates the emergence of lexicogrammatical innovations in ELF interactions. In particular, Ranta (2006: 112) and later Pitzl, Breiteneder and Klimpfinger (2008: 40-41) find instances in their data in which speakers’ lexicogrammatical innovations are motivated by what they call “*increasing clarity*”. Elsewhere, Breiteneder, Klimpfinger and Pitzl (2009: *passim*) also find that the reason behind the lexicogrammatical innovations in ELF interactions is the speakers’ interest in “*increasing clarity*”,

“economy of expression”, “regularisation” and “filling lexical gaps”. In the same vein, Seidlhofer (2009b) reports that the lexicogrammatical variants for some speakers in ELF conversations are associated with *“increasing semantic transparency”*.

In addition, Pitzl (2009) uses the VOICE corpus and looks at idioms and metaphors in ELF, focusing on their metaphorical functions. What she finds is that the idioms or metaphors which originate from the English linguacultural background manage to fulfil the communicative functions which she names *“providing emphasis”, “increasing explicitness”, “elaborating on a point”* and *“talking about abstract concepts”* (p. 317). To illustrate this with an example, in her data, during a business meeting of speakers of German and Dutch, one of the Dutch speakers used the idiom “put my hands into the fire for it”. As Pitzl explains, this idiomatic expression does not exist in English neither does it exist in German or Dutch, and she argues that it is coined and used instead of the readily available verb phrase ‘I promise’ or ‘I guarantee’. Thus, the conclusion which Pitzl reaches is that this example is a functional instance of *“providing emphasis”* regarding the sincerity of the speaker’s proposition.

Likewise, Klimpfinger (2009) also uses the VOICE corpus, and presents various instances and types of code-switching, while at the same time she also provides some explanations of code-switching based on different theoretical and methodological perspectives. As she explains, the following four functions emerged in the ELF interactions which she analysed: *“specifying an*

addressee, *“introducing another idea”*, *“appealing for assistance”* and *“signalling culture”* (p. 352). For instance, an instance in which a particular addressee was specified occurred in her data when a French-L1 postgraduate student had just given a presentation to a group of classmates and tutors and he also offered to email the paper to those who were interested in it. When another French speaker from the group suggested that the French version of the paper should also be made available, the presenter switched into their shared French-L1 and immediately responded positively to the suggestion with a repeated *“oui”* (*“yes”*). As Klimpfinger argues, this way, the presenter made it obvious that his response was aimed at a particular interlocutor, hence the pragmatic function *“specifying an addressee”*.

Furhermore, Cogo and Dewey (2006: 87) look at their data and add that lexicogrammatical variation in ELF communication is also motivated by the speakers’ need for *“efficiency of communication”*, *“added prominence”*, *“reinforcement of proposition”*, *“increased explicitness”* and *“exploiting of redundancy”*. On a similar note, Dewey (2007a: passim, b: 339) also identifies the motivations of *“exploiting redundancy”*, *“enhancing prominence”*, *“increasing explicitness”* and *“reinforcement of proposition”*, as well as he shows that these motivations are also associated with the all permeating transformative nature of globalisation. Elsewhere, Cogo (2010: passim) builds on the earlier work of Mauranten (2000: 138-140), in which she discussed *“self-rephrasing”*, *“negotiating topic”* and *“discourse reflexivity”*, as well as on her own previous work (e.g. Cogo 2009), in which she shows how participants in

ELF interactions skilfully use various strategies in order to prevent non-understanding and in turn to ensure that their talk continues running smoothly. She now talks of “*meaning enhancement*” and she argues that there is the need to focus on strategies of meaning-making. What is interesting is that she also goes on to name the meaning-making strategies of “*using translation cues*”, “*drawing on plurilingual resources*” and “*enhancing and expanding meaning*”, which she identifies in her data.

What is more, Cogo (2008) sets out to deconstruct the objections to ELF which were previously raised by Saraceni (2008). What Saraceni had argued is that in the studies of authors who write about ELF it is not clear whether ELF refers to the form or to the function of English in the way that it is used among non-native speakers as a common language for communication. In her reply, Cogo elaborates on the nature of the forms and functions of ELF. For instance, she explains that “ELF is both form *and* function” (p. 60, italics in the original). This is because, as she explains, “by performing certain functions, [ELF] is appropriated by its speakers and changed in form. In other words, form seems to follow function and start a circular phenomenon of variation and change” (ibid.). As she adds, “functional motives can lead to changes in the form (lexis, grammar and phonology), and in turn lexicogrammatical innovations impact on pragmatic strategies” (pp. 60-61).

A slightly different focus on lexicogrammar and its pragmatic significance is provided by Kaur (2010). Building on her previous work (e.g. Kaur 2009), in

which she showed how interactants managed to pre-empt potential misunderstanding in ELF situations as their conversations unfolded, she now discusses the success of ELF interactants to sustain their understanding. However, she also brings in her discussion her observation that this is achieved despite what she calls “gaps in world knowledge”. That is, ELF interlocutors manage to communicate despite the lack of their shared social and cultural assumptions and values due to their different social and cultural backgrounds. In light of this, Kaur argues that the pragmatic functions regarding meaning-making from the perspective of the lexicogrammar of ELF have been hitherto framed too narrowly, and there is still plenty to be done in order to understand how meaning-making and in turn how communication is achieved in ELF interactions in terms of speakers’ strategic use of language and in turn in term of the functions related to the observed lexicogrammatical forms.

2.5. Research focus and questions of the study

Let us take stock here for a while and see where this research study stands now. As it was discussed so far, many ELF studies set out to discern the lexicogrammatical features which are characteristic in ELF interactions, and indeed many of these features were discerned and reported. It was also shown that these lexicogrammatical features can be considered innovative, in so far as they are not part of Standard English, but they emerge only during the speakers’ co-construction of meaning and unfolding of their ELF interactions. It

was shown too that the understanding of the motivations behind the emergence of these innovations in ELF lexicogrammar is an essential part towards understanding various issues about the usage and use as well as about the role of ELF lexicogrammar in communicative situations between interlocutors who come from differing linguacultural backgrounds. For instance, before the studies which set out to investigate what gives rise to these lexicogrammatical innovations in ELF, lexicogrammatical variants were approached from a linguistic deficit perspective (cf. the notion of deficit linguistics in e.g. Quirk 1990) and they were thus attributed to factors such as speakers' incomplete knowledge of a particular lexicogrammatical item in the target language, negative L1 transfer or access, fossilisation, heavy processing load, anxiety during the use of L2, and so on. As a result, these lexicogrammatical variants were considered 'errors' and 'mistakes', and the interlocutors were seen as language learners who could not achieve to exhibit native speaker mastery of the language. On the contrary, ELF-informed studies suggest that speakers from diverse linguacultural backgrounds who use English as their common and shared language for communication should be considered English language users in their own right without any reference to ENL norms. In turn, ELF lexicogrammatical innovations should be looked at with the need to be legitimatised and not automatically be considered from any linguistic deficit perspective.

It was also explained that there is the need not to focus only on the lexicogrammar and wordings of ELF in their own right, but to investigate them

with reference to how the lexicogrammatical features in ELF interactions can be drawn from the entire gamut of the speakers' linguacultural backgrounds in order for them to make meaning in their communicative situations through the pragmatic functions which they set out to achieve. Along these lines, the pragmatic role of various lexicogrammatical forms and other features was discussed in a variety of ELF studies. However, I think I am safe to say that these functional-pragmatic aspects of ELF are still far from being fully researched. With this study, then, I would like to contribute to the existing body of literature in this field by investigating how meaning is made by means of the pragmatic functions achieved through the use of the wordings of ELF, as opposed, say, through intonation or silences. Indeed, by looking at how meaning-making is achieved with a focus on wordings in ELF interactions, what may be a hunch is that there are more functions achieved by interlocutors in ELF contexts, it may be revealed that more than one function is being achieved at the same time, and so on.

Needless to say, this study does not accept that specific wordings can be associated *per se* with the achievement of specific pragmatic functions. This would be reminiscent of long forlorn views on language, according to which meaning resides in the individual word or phrase or expression. Instead, what informs this study is the belief that there is a wide range of social factors which come into play sometimes individually and sometimes collectively and affect which pragmatic functions which these wordings help achieve, or at least factors which are outside the borders of each utterance. One of these factors is

the inherent variability in terms of the languages which are brought along in ELF interactions by the participating speakers, in so far as by definition any ELF context includes English and at least two other languages or language dialects or varieties, as the participants come from different linguacultural backgrounds. It is worth noting that this is such an important factor that even scholars whose work was outside the immediate ELF paradigm have acknowledged it, although they have approached it from different angles and discussed it in different ways.

For instance, Widdowson (1998) argues that the consideration of contextual meaning is ever more imperative nowadays due to the spread of English and its variable usage and use by many speakers in many settings around the world. In the same vein, Scollon and Scollon (1995) discuss the fact that the variability of the backgrounds of speakers who use English nowadays opens up a whole new world of challenges as well as of opportunities to investigate how to use English to make meaning in new ways. As they explain, this is so, because in addition to knowing the formal elements of English, it is interesting to shed some more light on how English speakers from diverse backgrounds come together and bring along elements from their differing backgrounds thus bringing about a new context for language usage and use. As they put it (p. 22), “the shared knowledge of grammar is well known to be essential for effective communication... Our purpose is to emphasize the shared knowledge of context which is required for successful communication”. This echoes the much earlier concern of Hymes (1962, 1968, 1972, 1974, etc) regarding the inclusion of a ‘social’ dimension in the description of language competence, whereby it is

important to also consider the context in which language use takes place. Similarly, it echoes a later discussion again by Hymes (1994) in which he proposes that language should not be approached as an abstract correlate of a community nor as an abstracted form, but “as situated in the flux and pattern of communicative events” (p. 12). Surely, ever since these Hymesean ideas were put forward much has changed in the world, but these ideas are still relevant to the field. And I would actually say that it is even more timely to follow up on these ideas nowadays due to the large number of speakers of English around the world and to the diversity of their linguacultural backgrounds, as well as due to the plethora of contexts in which these interlocutors employ English in order to communicate.

In order to further the field, then, with reference to the investigation of meaning-making in ELF discourse, by providing as a platform from which to set out to explore the achieved pragmatic functions of speakers who come from differing linguacultural backgrounds and who employ English as their common and shared language for communication, the following research questions were formulated:

1. To what extent is it possible to identify wordings and other features of discourse which are characteristic of interactions in contexts where English is used as a lingua franca, and how do they contribute to meaning-making in ELF interactions?

2. To what extent do successful ELF interactions require competences, skills and practices which are additional to those already described in the research literature, and how can they be best described and accounted for?

At this point, a caveat is needed here, as it has to do with some aspects around the research questions. One line of action regarding when or how to formulate the research questions in a study is associated with their formulation *in situ*, that is, while conducting the research and while collecting and analysing some data, as some scholars suggest (e.g. Bogdan and Bicklen 1992). However, this has to do with instances in which a research study is already being conducted, or with instances in which phenomena or practices are already taking place and they bring about some interest in the mind of a researcher who sets out to investigate them further. In my case, this was certainly partly the case, in so far as various linguistic experiences of my past as a language user and various linguistic phenomena and practices found in the ELF literature engendered some interest in me, as discussed above both in the section of the personal background of mine in the introduction as well as in the present literature review chapter. However, there was more to that. This is so, because, in the framework of conducting a PhD research study and writing a PhD thesis, one phase spills into the other and the whole process is circular too. As such, the research questions initially have to be formulated before actually starting conducting the research and collecting the data and analysing them. For that matter, what I did is that I first developed an interest in a particular field due to my past

experiences and its discussion in the existing literature, and then I opted for identifying some sort of a gap in that field and I formulated the research questions whose answers would address this gap. Subsequently, while the research was being conducted and the data were being collected and analysed, the research focus and the questions of this study were being revisited and refined over and over again.

In the next chapter, where the theoretical considerations of this study are discussed and the methodological decisions are justified, and in particular in the section which elaborates on the ethnographic elements which were adopted for this purposes of this study, some more characteristics about these research questions are provided. For the time being, it could be added that the research questions of this study are what Strauss (1987) calls “generative questions”. This kind of questions stimulate a line of investigation and suggest areas for data collection. In other words, they resemble some kind of ‘compass’ which helps the researcher ‘navigate’ around the vast amount of the available options regarding the type of data and the data collection process, and take some kind of informed decisions for that matter. Having said that, these questions did not foreclose the possibility of modification as the research develops. As Flick (2004) suggests, some kind of balance needs to be kept between having research questions which are neither too broad to lack a sense of working direction neither too narrow to proscribe new explorations and inquiries.

2.6. Summary

This chapter starts with a discussion of how English spread from England to the rest of the world, and it suggests that the reasons behind this spread were initially the British colonialism and subsequently the might of the United States. The discussion then moves on to some of the consequences and implications of this spread, including the contemporary global pre-eminence of the English language and the fact that English nowadays permeates many aspects of the everyday life of people around the world, as well as the English language variation and change which can be seen as a corollary of this spread. The terms and models which are found in the literature associated with these developments are then examined. English as a Lingua Franca as the paradigm of the present study is introduced at this point, and there was a discussion of the body of work which looked at various aspects of lexicogrammatical and other innovations in ELF interactions. This chapter concludes with the explication that the research study sets out to investigate meaning-making in ELF interactions from the perspective of how wordings and other features of discourse are used and which pragmatic functions are thus achieved. In addition, it sets out to investigate the competences, skills and practices which are identified in ELF interactions in which speakers from ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds use English as their common and shared language of communication.

CHAPTER 3.

CONCEPTUAL CONSIDERATIONS AND METHODOLOGICAL DECISIONS

3.1. Introduction

This chapter opens with its conceptual considerations by means of providing the theoretical framework within which this study was conducted. In particular, it explains that this study sees the variation in the language use of non-native speakers of English not as ENL deficiency but as ELF difference, themselves not as ENL learners but as ELF users, and their interactions not as failed ENL discourse but as attempts for successful ELF communication. These points are emphasised in this chapter, because, along with the research focus and questions of this study, it was these very conceptual and theoretical considerations which subsequently led to these particular methodological decisions regarding the research design of this study. Following that, there is discussion of the various key aspects with regard to the research design and the data collection and analysis process. Thus, it is justified why for the purposes of this study a naturalistic interpretive qualitative research approach was adopted. Likewise, it is justified why particular elements from the research traditions of ethnography and conversation analysis were found to be appropriate, respectively combining the consideration of the context of the investigated interactions with a meticulous investigation of how the interactions

were unfolding moment by moment. Then, this chapter moves on to describe how the data comprised naturally occurring spoken discourse from international students, audio recorded while they were holding meetings in order to establish an international student society at the University of London Union. It also recounts how the notes which I was taking during these meetings and other notes of the students' linguistic practices outside these meetings which I or they were taking, as well as post-event semi-structured interviews with some of these students, were also found to be important during the data analysis process.

3.2. Theoretical framework

3.2.1. ELF difference and not ENL deficiency

Some decades ago, variationist sociolinguistics studies (e.g. Labov 1963, Trudgill 1974, Tudgill and Hannah 1985) used to dwell on arguing how Standard English was the preferred model of English, while certain phonological or other features from others varieties and dialects of English which varied from Standard English were dispreferred. A similar key issue which informs the vast majority of the ELF-related research studies is the language difference between what is noted in research on ELF interactions between speakers from different linguacultural backgrounds and what is customarily known and thought to be the case in Standard English. This difference is of paramount importance as an

issue in the field, and it is associated with the distinction between native speakers (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs). In turn, it is also related with the distinction between language users and language learners. All these are important issues to be clear about, as they are of central relevance to this study as well, as it is explained below.

The notion of the idealised native speaker and the reliance on this notion for an unproblematised classification of speakers, especially when it comes to the speakers of the English language, in so far as it is the English language which is by far used by speakers who are not born to it more than any other language in the world nowadays, as it was discussed in the previous chapter, is an often cited one. Where it stems from is the classification of English language speakers as native speakers and non-native speakers. This classification is based on a single one characteristic, the one of when these speakers started being exposed to the English language. This means that any focus on what these speakers can potentially or actually do with the language has been left out the conversation. That is, for this classification, the only criterion is whether speakers were born to the English language and thus whether this was the first language which they got to know, or whether they started engaging with it at a later stage in their lives after one or more than one other language before it. This distinction has brought about a pervasive ideology around native speakers in SLA and in many intercultural communication studies which dwell on notions such as interlanguage, negative transfer or interference, mother language (ML), target language (TL), and so on. It essentially keeps the NSs' language norms

as the single one and only yardstick of English language attainment, and in turn the NSs are considered to be the ultimate authority about the English language or they come to be taken as the model whose accent, syntax, lexis, and other aspects of English have to be emulated. As Dewey (2007a: 56) notes for that matter,

the NS continues customarily to be regarded as a NS of English because it is his or her first language, the mother tongue, rather than for any defining linguistic characteristic. In determining who does or does not qualify as a NS, it is (assigned) biogenetic and/or geographic identity that matters and not efficiency or success in language use.

However, this binary categorisation has lately started being challenged, in so far as it is extensively problematic for a variety of reasons. For instance, this binary categorisation by definition creates two categories, native speakers and non-native speakers, and all the speakers of English have to be assigned to one or the other category. But, as it was shown in the previous chapter, when the terms and models regarding the spread of English were discussed, the NS model is not something concrete and tangible. Likewise, there are speakers of English who are bilinguals, or others for whom English may have been the language of their home but not necessarily the language of their school or of their immediate social context. Also, there are speakers of English who were not born to the language and as such they should be categorised as non-natives speakers, but nevertheless they were exposed to English from such an early age and for so long that at some stage in their lives their language

features cannot be differentiated from those of the native ones. These speakers cannot be readily assigned to either of these customary two categories. In addition, this binary categorisation places all the non-native speakers of English in the same category, no matter the level of English which they have attained, their perception of this level, their purposes, or whether this level is sufficient to meet their communicative needs (see more about this issue in Leung, Harris and Rampton 1997).

Taking on board the above considerations, the varying wordings in this study are not approached from a linguistic deficit perspective, and thus they are not considered errors or mistakes, they are not attributed to factors such as speakers' incomplete of a particular wording in the target language, negative L1 transfer or interference, or fossilisation, and in turn the interactants in this study are not seen as failed native speakers exhibiting some kind of ENL deficiency. Instead, any variants in the discourse of the participants in this study, all of them coming from diverse linguacultural backgrounds and using English as their common and shared language for communication in their personal and academic life, is considered legitimate ELF difference in its own right. What this means for this study is further discussed below, when this legitimate ELF difference is linked to successful ELF communication, which will constitute the main data of this study, as it is explained below too. For the time being, it is also important to see how the distinction of ELF difference as opposed to ENL deficiency is associated with a related distinction, that of ELF users as opposed to ENL learners.

3.2.2. ELF users and not ENL learners

Further to the above, Cook (1999, 2000) also argues that it is necessary to problematise and deconstruct the NS speaker model as the benchmark against which the language features of all the speakers of English has to be compared. However, this customary belief is perpetuated as long as the NS speaker model continues being considered the single one language model which is worth aiming at. This being the case, Cook argues in favour of the need to make a distinction not between native speakers and non-native speakers of English but between learners and users of English. What this distinction offers, as he explains, is that it does not equate a native speaker of English with any kind of authority while excluding a non-native speaker from such an accreditation, but both a native speaker and a non-native one can be considered legitimate users of English depending on the way that they can use the language. Similarly, both native and non-native English speakers can be regarded learners, if they continue learning a language, in which case the English language has to be referred to as 'Ln' for them. However, it should also be recognised that it is not clear when language speakers stop being learners and become users of the language. Likewise, it is not clear whether speakers ever stop learning a language no matter whether this is their native language or another language for them.

Still, the distinction between language users and language learners goes a long way towards providing a safer framework for the conceptualisation of English

language speakers, due to the issues which were discussed above. In addition, there is also something more gained from such a conceptualisation. The previous binary distinction between native and non-native speakers takes a linguistic deficit perspective, and it essentially sees all the non-native speakers of English as failed native speakers. In turn, the way in which the non-native speakers of English use English is attributed to some kind of language deficiency and is not recognised as variation. What this means is that all the choices of wordings and pragmatic functions which vary from their equivalent ones in Standard English and which emerge in ELF interactions due to the speakers' differing linguacultural backgrounds are considered errors or mistakes.

However, it is exactly the ratification and validation of the speakers' linguacultural backgrounds which give credit to the notion of language users. This is so, because the vast majority of the English speakers nowadays are non-native speakers, as it is discussed in the previous chapter. More importantly, again as it is discussed in the previous chapter, the primary role of the English language nowadays is that of a lingua franca between speakers who come from different linguacultural backgrounds and who use it to communicate with one another. Thus, it is unwise to associate or equate the most characteristic and unique trait of the English language use nowadays with some kind of drawback. As Seidlhofer puts it (2001: 137), ELF needs to be looked at as language in use "in its own right", that is, without any attempt to compare and contrast it with any pre-existing language norms and categories.

Similarly, as Jenkins' (2006b) notes, such a view sees the non-native speakers of English not as deficient language learners but as accomplished language users in ELF interactions.

This view is adopted in this study too. Thus, this study does not accept the classification of the English language speakers into native and non-native ones. In turn, it does not follow the monolingual bias which sees the native speakers as the ultimate custodians of the English language and as the yardstick which determines what is acceptable and what is not with reference to the usage and use of the English language. In turn, it does not operate under the consideration of non-native speakers as failed native ones, and likewise it does not consider their language variation as deficient language use. On the contrary, this study sees the speakers who use English as a lingua franca to communicate with other speakers from different linguacultural backgrounds as legitimate language users, and in turn their language use is considered in its own right. In particular, as it is discussed below in the section about the participants in this study, such a view on English and English users led to the recruitment of non-native speakers who were studying at the University of London and thus they were regular users of English for academic and social purposes. In particular, it is mainly their conversations with one another while they were using English as their common and shared language of communication which are looked at for the purposes of this study.

3.2.3. Successful ELF communication and not failed ENL discourse

The two previous sections elaborated on the two first conceptual considerations regarding the theoretical framework within which this study operates. In particular, what was explained is why ELF sees the speakers who use English in order to communicate with others from differing linguacultural backgrounds as language users, as well as it explained what this means for the way it looks at their interactions, and in turn why their interactions are considered legitimately different and thus they should be looked at in their own right. These bring to the fore the third consideration, which has to do with the notion of what exactly successful ELF communication is. It is important to discuss this too, as it is instances of successful ELF communication which will constitute the data that this study will analyse, as it is explained below. Based on the above, it could be understood that successful communication in ELF contexts is taken to be any exchange which is meaningful and fruitful for the participants, in the sense that the participants manage to achieve their intended purpose or purposes. As such, successful ELF communication does not depend on notions of comparison and contrast of the speakers' language use according to any pre-defined ENL criteria and standards.

It has to be conceded, however, that interactions may sometimes be communicatively successful even with few words or even in the absence of language, thanks to various paralinguistic or extralinguistic features or thanks to other contextual cues. For instance, if a passenger gets on a bus and gives the

driver some cash, and then receives the ticket and the change, their transaction will have taken place successfully even if they did not even exchange not even a word with each other. No matter how important and useful these aspects are towards understanding what successful communication is as a whole, this study is about the linguistic aspect of successful communication, and in particular it is about the linguistic aspect of successful communication as outlined above. It is quite clear that these two cannot be easily separated and should not be separated either, but what I am trying to explain here with reference to the linguistic interactions which will be analysed below is that the context in which they took place will be considered, but it is the language exponents of the interactants which will be looked at, in so far as this is a language-related research study.

Thus understood and thus delineated, successful ELF communication is of paramount importance, and it is also of central relevance to this study too. In particular, as Mauranen points out (2006: 155), “in order to keep up with current developments in the target language we must complement our existing databases with English in international use”, and elsewhere “what I am suggesting is that data of successful ELF discourse is indispensable for modelling communicative strategies in authentic speech” (ibid.). What Mauranen stresses here is the importance of further investigation of how English is used as a lingua franca between speakers who come from different linguacultural backgrounds in order to communicate with one another. Her call for such an investigation is taken up in this study, in so far as this study is about

the use of English in international contexts. In addition, Mauranen acknowledges the importance of successful ELF discourse for the investigation of communication in authentic speech. Again, this is central to this study too, as what this study sets out to discern is more communication-related issues than the already described in the literature, by means of the ways that ELF speakers make use of their available resources in order to achieve various pragmatic functions, as the analytical chapters yield below. This being the case, in order to answer the research questions formulated in this study, it is instances of successful ELF communication which will be analysed below. In particular, what will be analysed is natural occurring spoken discourse between international students who came from different linguacultural backgrounds and who used English as their common and shared language when they were holding meetings in order to establish an international student society at the University of London, as it is explained in the next section where the research site and the participants are discussed.

3.3. Research design

3.3.1. Approaches to language and language analysis

3.3.1.1. An ethnographic perspective

The previous three sections elaborate on the conceptual considerations by means of providing the theoretical framework within which this study was conducted. In particular, what is explained is why ELF sees the speakers who use English in order to communicate with others from differing linguacultural backgrounds as language users, as well as it explains that these language users' interactions are legitimate and are thus looked at in their own right in ELF studies. In turn, it is shown what exactly successful ELF communication is, and it is mentioned that this constitutes the main body of data in this study, as it is discussed further below too. In a few words, in order to collect and analyse data in a way that would do justice to ELF as a phenomenon of natural sociolinguistic variation and not as an imperfect rendition of any pre-arranged and pre-defined code of communication, this study places emphasis on the fact that meaning is better construed through careful consideration not only of speakers' words, but also of the entirety of the speakers' context of interactions.

Thus, since this study concerns language, it could be argued that it also tried to attend to Firth's (1957) call to investigate the total linguistic fact, that is, to investigate language within the holistic context of the situation, which includes

the entire gamut of the linguistic exponents of the speakers, as shaped by their personalities and lives, and so on, as well as they are shaped by them as well. As Firth argued, linguistic forms do not equate statements of meaning, and meaning is better understood by the examination of the employed linguistic forms within what he called “the interior relations of the context of the situation” (p. 112). The inclusion of the ‘social’ in the equation and its significance regarding a close examination of the context in which communication takes place as well as various sociocultural aspects of the context, made Hymes’ (e.g. 1962, 1968, 1972, 1974) tradition relevant to this research study. Hymes’ ideas will be discussed at some length in a subsequent section, from the perspective of communicative competence. For the time being, what has to be reiterated is that Hymes (1972: 281, bold in the original) suggested that four empirical questions should be raised for the investigation of language in its social context: “1) Whether (and to what degree) something is formally **possible**; 2) Whether (and to what degree) something is **feasible** in virtue of the means of means of implementation available; 3) Whether (and to what degree) something is **appropriate** (adequate, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated; and 4) Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually **performed**, and what its doing entails”. Hymes’ call for an ethnographic investigation to answer these questions was taken on board in this research study as well, as it is explained below.

As such, the data of this study are analysed following the interpretive tradition of research (Wolcott 1994). In so doing, an emic approach is adopted whereby

my intention is to try to engage as subtly as possible with the language practices and meanings in the interactions of the participants, and not an etic approach whereby my concern would be to look at these practices and meanings as something which I could identify and report with an arguably objective manner (cf. Bridges 2003). Overall, then, my approach to data analysis is qualitative rather than quantitative, in the sense that I look at my data trying to identify meaning-making practices and meanings which are common and frequent, but which more importantly they seem sufficiently telling (Arsenault and Anderson 1998, LeCompte and Preissle 1993, Woods 1992). All the above overarching considerations are attended to with reference to the particular field of endeavour of this research study, which was educational research (Hammersley 2002).

As it is mentioned above, this study draws various elements from the ethnographic tradition and combines them with certain aspects from the tradition of conversation analysis (CA). This combination is common in research studies which seek to combine macro- and micro-elements when it comes to the investigation of linguistic practices (see more about this combination in e.g. Moerman 1988). The particular way that this took place in this research study is the aim of the discussion of this section. As a discipline, ethnography allows the researcher to explore practices and their meanings in social and cultural contexts, and to provide accounts of what is investigated. In other words, as Dobbert and Kurth-Schai (1992) point out, the task of the ethnographer is to be committed to the social sciences by seeking to observe the variability, diversity,

creativity, individuality and uniqueness of the participants and their interactions. Thus, ethnographic studies tend to look at real world situations (Robson 2002).

It is also worth noting that a research study can vary from being fully ethnographic to adopting an ethnographic perspective (Green and Bloome 1997, Heath and Street 2008). This study is not a fully ethnographic one, but it adopts various elements which are characteristic of ethnography. First of all, ethnographic studies do not operate with the idea of pre-determining what to set out to see, but they rather work with the concept of suggesting directions as to where to go (Blumer 1969). Likewise, this study is set in such a way that it does not try to test any hypotheses about meaning-making in ELF interactions, but rather to explore ELF having only some hunches about some of its aspects. This way, for instance, in this study nothing is pre-determined, and even the research questions, which had to be formulated before setting out to start conducting the actual research and the data collection process, changed their focus various times, as it was discussed above. This being the case, it could be said that the conceptual considerations and the theoretical framework related to this study and its initial focus, as well as the subsequent methodological decisions regarding the data collection and the data analysis, are not clearly distinguishable stages which take place one after the other, but rather they are in a dialogue and they are multifariously informing one another.

In a similar vein, ethnographic studies do not start with any pre-arranged analytic categories or with any pre-defined codes, and in that sense the data

are not structured. As Agar (1996) emphasises, researchers who conduct ethnographic studies usually have to collect a variety of data from very diverse sources (see also e.g. Burke and Christensen 2008, Murray 2003), which they have to be made sense of and organised according to the emerging patterns. Likewise, as Blommaert (2001: 2) puts it, “the interpretation of field data is in practice often the (re)construction of meanings in data by means of post-hoc structuring, categorizing and clarification”. In the same way, as it is discussed in the next section, the data in this study range from attending and audio-recording naturally occurring spoken discourse during meetings, to field notes, to post-session interviews with the participants of the study. All of them led to a body of data which are able to “speak for themselves” as much as possible, in Cohen, Manion and Morrison’s words (2007: 256), without losing sight of the research focus and questions of this study.

In addition, Geertz (1973) gives a description of ethnographic work as aiming at what he calls “thick description”, a term which has to do with the compilation of a rich account of the investigated phenomena taking into consideration of the surrounding context around them too. Accordingly, as it is shown in the subsequent analytical chapters, this study also tries to take into consideration and in many occasions to provide a variety of details about the investigated language phrases or expressions, in addition to the way that they are used in the analysed interactions. This is possible thanks to the wide variety of data collected for the purposes of this study. This is also possible through my involvement in this study both as a researcher and as an observer, as for

instance I was also present during the students' meetings which were audio-recorded too. At this point, it has to be conceded that it is difficult to be clear as to whether and how much some of the collected data were possibly influenced (cf. Landsberger 1958 regarding the Hawthorne effect, and Labov 1972 regarding the observer's paradox with particular reference to sociolinguistics research). My estimate is that this did not take place at all, or at least that it was kept at a minimum, judging from what I gathered from the students themselves. For instance, during the post-session interviews which we had, they were all mentioning that my presence did not affect in any negative way what they were saying and how they were saying it. The other option would be for me not to be present in these meetings. However, this way, I would risk leaving my audio-recording equipment with the students, and also perhaps they would forget carrying out the audio-recording. Also, even if they were carrying out the audio-recording, this would be everything which I would have to analyse from the meetings, without any supplementation with my field notes and my personal recollection of these meetings, all of which proved useful at times.

Further to the above, ethnographic studies are usually not quantitative but qualitative, as it was mentioned above. One of the decisions that this entail with reference to data collection is that they aim at collecting data not from a wide number of participants or at looking at a wide number of cases, but from relatively few participants and at a few cases. With reference to data analysis, this also means that their aim is not to discover any universal and widely generalisable truths, but rather to look closely at some cases which are telling

enough (Merriam 1988, Nisbet and Watt 1984, Sturman 1999). In other words, as Geertz (1973: 25) puts it, this way the focus is on “the delicacy of distinctions rather the sweep of abstractions”. In line with these considerations, this study does not aim at being fully representative of the whole population of the English users nowadays. This would be impossible anyway. Instead, some degree of analytic induction is employed, in order to find out which cases are telling and in what regard. In other words, there is an effort to identify what issues are raised and what phenomena are illustrated in the investigated cases. In turn, there is some kind of attempt to see the significance of these cases, as it is specifically discussed in the chapter with the implications of this study (and also see Stake 1994 regarding the identification of the case, and Mitchel 1984 regarding the typicality of the case under investigation). In the words of Burrawoy (1998: 4), regarding the extended case method, a research study is able to “locate everyday life in its extralocal and historical context”.

Finally, ethnography informs extensively the study of linguistic practices (see e.g. Hymes 1962, 1968, 1972, 1974, 1994, as well as e.g. Creese 2008 and Rampton et al. 2004 for a “Neo-Hymesean” linguistic ethnographic perspective). For instance, Hymes (ibid.) used to challenge the assumptions of linguistic as well as of sociocultural homogeneity and he focused on language use in interaction. He thus postulated that linguistic meaning is created and thus best understood not as a pre-determined value which is inherent in some linguistic forms or in some linguistic rules but only within and as an integral part of a context. This study too does not see meaning as inherently residing in

linguistic forms, and in turn it does not see meaning-making as equated only with the rules of use of these forms. Instead, it sees meaning-making as dialogically shaped depending on the particular context, which includes what is said, but it also includes the reasons why it is said, by whom, to whom, when, and so on. However, an important point has to be made here. Hymes' critiqued the fact that linguistics do not make ethnography the starting point of language use analysis and understanding, and in the same way he laments the fact that ethnographic studies which are supposed to investigate linguistic practices and meanings do not draw sufficiently on linguistics in order to describe the overarching context in which linguistic interactions take place, as well as they do not look closely enough at these linguistic interactions. Taking this consideration into account, as this study focuses on linguistic practices and meanings too, the ethnographic perspective of this study is eclectically complemented with specific elements from the rich language analytic tradition of Conversation Analysis (CA). Which these specific elements are and how they are utilised in the analysis of the naturally occurring spoken discourse which was collected for the purposes of this study, is explained below.

3.3.1.2. Elements from conversation analysis

Conversation analysis, as pioneered by scholars such as a Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (e.g. Schegloff and Sacks 1973; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974; Schlegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977), sets out to investigate ordinary communication, and in particularly it looks at the organisation and management

of talk which constitutes part of everyday interactions. As Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) put it, conversation analysis provides “a systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: *talk-in-interaction*” (p. 13, emphasis in the original). In a similar vein, Zimmerman (1998: 411) adds that conversation analysis sets out “to discover and describe ‘the machinery’ of conversation, that is, the resources for organizing interaction that members of society draw upon to manage their everyday activity”. Conversation analysis is utilised in a great number of studies, and Li (2002: 163) divides them into two categories. Some of them may be considered to be pure conversation analysis studies, in so far as they adopt conversation analysis in its entirety, as a methodological and analytical paradigm which is supposed to investigate some kind of social order of interaction. Other studies may be considered applied conversation analysis studies, as they adopt and adapt some of the conversation analytic tools and techniques in order to investigate various social phenomena and cultural practices in interaction. According to this distinction, this study could be taken to be an applied conversation analysis study, as several of the tools and techniques of CA were combined with an ethnographic perspective, as mentioned above.

In general, conversation analysis provides a means for the language analyst to get closer to the interlocutors’ language and in particular to processes of its understanding. For instance, Gumperz (1982, 1999, etc) notes the analytical strength of conversation analysis from the perspective of its emphasis on the negotiated character of the situation. Later on, Bremer et al. (1996) also explain

the contribution of conversation analysis for language investigation, elaborating on the fact that it can help the analyst investigate the turn-by-turn unfolding of the interaction, and thus to show the turn-by-turn co-construction of the conversation and the meaning in it. Along the same lines, and with a focus on the language users' drawing from across their language background, Li (2002) finds that "(CA) avoids the imposition of the analyst-oriented classificatory frameworks and instead attempts to reveal the underlying procedural apparatus by which conversation participants themselves arrive at local interpretations of language choice" (pp. 166-167). The use of language items from various sources which the speakers have available in the course of a single interaction constitutes an extensive investigative focus in the analytical chapters of this study too, as it is shown below. Thus, what Li discusses with regard the contribution of conversation analysis is important.

Conversation analysis is mainly interested in the sequential organisation of talk, from the perspective of how a previous utterance determines the subsequent utterance, and in turn how this subsequent utterance shapes the meaning of the following utterance, and so on. Thus, according to conversation analysis, the unfolding nature of talk dynamically constructs the social context (e.g. Heritage 1998). In turn, since the main concern of the participants in an interaction is to participate in a communicative activity and to achieve mutual understanding, conversation analysis looks at how the interactants appraise one another's utterances in their communicative exchanges and how they thus co-construct their communicative activity. Therefore, conversation analysis is interested in

the way that meaning is interactionally co-constructed and how the interlocutors' inferences are signalled in their interactional exchanges. This aspect of the CA analytic framework is useful for the study of intercultural communication due to the fact that it highlights the importance of how interaction is negotiated, as well as it tries to provide an explanation of the way that participants' understanding takes place turn-by-turn (Bremer et. al. 1996). In other words, as Cogo and Dewey (2012: 32) put it referring to the particular way that meaning-making takes place in ELF interactions, meaning is a "situated practice", which they see as "being 'distributed' among the participants" and "residing in the interactive space between participants". Likewise, in the analysis of the data in the subsequent analytic chapters of this study, especially in the chapter which is about negotiation of meaning, students' meaning is seen as co-constructed in a turn-by-turn fashion during the unfolding of the interaction. This proves to be extensively helpful in trying to discern how meaning is made, and in turn in the effort to pin down which pragmatic functions which are thus achieved.

Closely associated with the way that talk is sequentially co-constructed as well as the way that participants jointly produce meaning, according to conversation analysis, is the fact that participants are actively involved in the production of their talk. In this sense, participants' involvement is a key feature of effective talk delivery (e.g. Goffman 1981, Tannen 1984a). Participants' interactional involvement is evident in their alignment during the turn-taking organisation of their talk, for instance, when they use appropriate adjacency pairs, such as accepting an invitation or replying to a request or answering a question, or when

they provide sufficient support of their interlocutors' turns, such as with back-channelling. Interactants' alignment is also evident in the way that they go about their role negotiation and their topic management during the interactional sequence. All these proved to be very relevant to the analysis of the spoken discourse in the analytical chapters of this study too. For instance, as it is shown later on, the students of the society of this study frequently had to manage and agree on particular topics such as the agenda items in their meetings, or to negotiate their roles in their conversation. From an analytical point of view, this is an important point, as many times it is the president of the society who has to assign his authority and ratify whether a term or a phrase or an expression which was just used is acceptable and appropriate for their conversation. In other words, meaning is considered to have been made only when such a term or a phrase or an expression is accepted.

However, various conversation analytic tools and techniques have received strong critiques, and it is worth discussing some of them here from the perspective of how this study adapted them in order to still make use of them for the purposes of answering its research questions. For instance, in CA, the heuristic technique of the two-turn adjacency pair has a central role. Duranti (1997) sees this machinery of conversation analysis as quite dry, and he argues that it can sometimes dwell on some features of the talk which are rather minor, while at the same time it does not pay due attention to the surrounding context of the interaction which may be more important regarding the interpretation of the talk. He thus refers to the fact that conversation analysis does not pay

attention to the wider context in which an interaction takes place, unless the speakers mention something relevant about it, or unless the interaction somehow signals the need or orients the analyst to pay attention to the context. Thus, conversation analysis seems to avoid taking into consideration various sociolinguistic variables, such as the participants' relationship with one another, their age, their gender, their ethnicity, or their linguacultural background. This is not to say that conversation analysis denies the existence of these variables or it discounts their relevance and the way that they factor in the linguistic interactions, but it just considers them only if the interactants explicitly refer to them or orient to them. In other words, conversation analysis does not assume these factors a priori, and it brings them to a bear only if they are explicitly proven in the data, as it relies only on what the data readily reveal.

Instead, this study is much more context-sensitive in order to serve its purposes. Thus, in addition to the interlocutors' words during their interactions, various other contextual characteristics around them, such as the speakers themselves, their language backgrounds, their sociocultural exposures and other experiences of their past are also taken into consideration. As Cogo and Dewey (2012: 32) characteristically write with reference to the context of their study, "the setting and the sociocultural fabric of the communities under investigation are all relevant". Among all these characteristics, in this study, the participants' linguacultural backgrounds is of particular importance for one more reason. As it is discussed above, since this study is about ELF, not only is it taken for granted that the participants comes from different linguacultural

backgrounds, but it is exactly the role and the influence of these linguacultural backgrounds which this study sets out to investigate, no matter whether the participants were aware of this role and influence and no matter whether they acknowledged them or mentioned them in their conversations. For instance, in the first analytical chapter, it is found that students use language flexibly by drawing a variety of phrases and expressions from their linguacultural backgrounds and they were thus achieving various pragmatic functions in their communicative encounters. Or, in other instances, they take issue of various topics as well as of various phrases and expressions which their interlocutors use, because of various aspects of their sociocultural backgrounds, such as their religious beliefs, and they express their disapproval of them, as it is shown.

Also, in conversation analysis, the analyst considers relevant only what is in the linguistic data. In doing so, conversation analysis aims at explaining how the interaction unfolds and how the interactants understand one another, but it does not pay attention to why an interaction unfolds this particular way and why the interactants understand one another this way too. In other words, conversation analysis advocates that the linguistic features in linguistic interactions should be analysed in their own right and not as means to something else (Schegloff 1991). Contrary to this, as it is shown in the analytical chapters later on, this study acknowledges the need for a close look at the language in the interactions which are analysed, such as on the sequential succession of turns, but at the same time it also expands its analytical focus. In doing so, it looks at the linguistic choices of the speakers not in their own right but in order to

discern the reasons behind their choices, and thus in order to find out the pragmatic functions achieved with the help of the employment of these linguistic elements which the speakers chose to use, which has to do with the research questions of this study too.

Another central tenet of conversation analysis which relates to the organisation of talk as evidenced in the interactional turn-taking system, is that only one speaker is supposed to take the floor and speak at the time (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). This means that any kind of overlapping talk was initially considered to be a violation of the turn taking system (*ibid.*). However, subsequent conversation analytic studies expanded their understanding on various aspects of overlapping talk, and for instance they found that overlapping and simultaneous talk may also signal an interactant's support of or even enthusiasm about what another interactant's proposition (e.g. Schegloff 2007). ELF studies tend to take on board this broader understanding of overlapping and simultaneous talk as highly useful for the smooth unfolding of the interaction (see e.g. Kaur 2009, Wolfartsberger 2011). Similarly, this study interprets the students' overlapping and simultaneous talk as a supportive and enthusiastic signal, when this is found to be the case. This means that, exactly as in the previous case of ratification and legitimisation of a phrase or an expression through the most senior or appropriate person in the meetings of the society after their role allocations, there are times that participants' interest and enthusiasm about phrases or expressions are also signalled from the way that

their talk overlapped with their interlocutors, as it is shown in many instances in the subsequent analytical chapters.

On another note, conversation analysis is also critiqued due to its assumed methodological transparency. For instance, Billig (1999), coming from an angle closely related to critical discourse analysis (CDA), takes issue of CA's ideological perspective which underlies its methodological position. As he explains, conversation analysis does not recognise the underlying ideological tenets of its methodology, in so far as it takes interactants' talk at face value and likewise it assumes equality in their right to talk. In a similar vein, Blommaert (2005) laments the fact that conversation analysis pays attention to contextual factors only when interactants demonstrably address them during their conversations, as it is mentioned above. As he argues, even if these contextual factors are not explicitly addressed during the course of a talk, they may be "made relevant by later re-entextualisations of that talk by others" (p. 19). What this means is that analysts who come to investigate a stretch of talk will do so having some ideological predilections and predispositions themselves, and this may affect the way that they see the various factors which come into play in a conversation, such as speakers' sociocultural background and their ethnicity, or some of their linguistic features such as their accents (cf. Johnstone 2009).

Similarly, Blommaert (*ibid.*) also questions CA's neutrality from the perspective of lack of criticality regarding the seemingly straightforward research stages of recording, coding, and transcribing the data, as well as analysing them

according to what 'stands out' as different from the norm. For that matter, it is naïve to insist here that I, as the researcher of this study, can claim any sort of neutrality and objectivity, and in turn to argue that I managed to analyse the participants' talk free of any personal ideological burden or other biases, because this way I would be victim of the same fallacy because of which conversation analysis is critiqued here. To preclude this, or at least to keep it at a minimum, I tried to go about the stages of the research design and data analysis in this study trying to avoid as much as possible any aspects of my personal creed to infiltrate and affect the analysis and the findings (see more on reflexivity in language studies e.g. in Archer 2007).

Further to the above, Hammersley (2003) points to a range of issues regarding conversation analysis. What he explains is that conversation analysis cannot be considered a self-sufficient methodological and analytical paradigm, and instead he calls for research eclecticism, whereby conversation analysis is complemented with elements from various other paradigms and traditions. As he argues, "(CA) could be usefully combined with other qualitative and quantitative approaches" (p. 772). As it is discussed above, this study tries to make the most of the analytic strength of conversation analysis, given the existence of the wide variety of conversation analytic tools and techniques which can help the analyst look into and account for what is immediately observable and describable. In addition to these readily available tools and techniques, this study also takes into consideration the various critiques of conversation analysis, and does away with what is insufficient for the purposes

of this study. Over and above all, this study tried to expand the investigative focus of conversation analysis by combining it with various methodological and analytical insights from ethnography, as it is discussed above.

3.3.1.3. Complementary analytic tools

It should also be mentioned that overall the data analysis was conducted focusing on participant discourse roles (Scollon 1996, building on Goffman 1981). This is because before anything else it had to be established that the students were speaking and in general interacting with one another on their own volition. Scollon (1996: 4) suggests that in language-mediated communication there is a mechanical, a rhetorical and a responsible aspect. In terms of language production, these aspects correspond to the role of animator, author and principle. In terms of language reception, they correspond to the role of the receptor, interpreter and judge. Leung (2013) and Leung and Lewkovitz (2012) explain these roles through an everyday example. When we talk to a family member or a friend (animator role), we choose our words (author role) and we take responsibility for what we say (principal role). When we listen to them (receptor role), we try to understand what we hear (interpreter role) and we decide how to respond (judge role). Needless to say, these roles are enacted in ways that may be affected by various sociocultural norms and conventions, and thus the interactants' volition may be influenced too. In the extracts which are looked at in the analytical chapters below, the language practices and their

pragmatic significance were identified, in so far as the interactants were engaged in situated and contingent meaning-making on their own volition.

In addition, as it is extensively discussed below, the meetings of the international students who participated in this research study were relatively casual and informal. Thus, elements from the particular analytic tradition of casual conversation will be drawn for the purposes of this analysis (Eggins and Slade 2004). This is so, because casual conversations have some characteristics which distinguish them from other speech types or genres. This has significant consequences regarding the tools which can best serve the analysis here. To illustrate this with an example, casual conversation are at one end of a continuum with reference to the degree according to which turns are pre-allocated. What this means is that, looking for instance at a job interview using the analytical lenses of turn-taking, there would be investigation of backchannelings and other cues which would signal the legitimisation of the speakers' right to talk. Any differentiation from this pattern would be considered as violation of the normative expectations, and would possibly lead to a seriously negative appraisal of the job applicant- interlocutor. On the other hand, in casual conversations between friends, such a differentiation in turn-taking may not necessarily have a negative appraisal of one another, and on the contrary it may even be taken as a signal of involvement and interest in their conversation (*ibid.*).

Also, the work of Eggins and Slade (2004) is relevant in this research study for one more reason. This is because they take a functional perspective to the analysis of naturally occurring spoken discourse. For instance, they propose a framework for the analysis of interactional discourse data comprising of three moves, namely, open, continue and respond/ rejoinder. This research study, as it was explained in the previous chapter, also looks to discern the functional-pragmatic significance of the language use of the students who participated in their meetings. In doing so, it also draws insights from the aforementioned three moves in the work of Eggins and Slade (*ibid.*). However, Eggins and Slade (*ibid.*) take an SFL perspective in terms of their analytic scope and overall agenda. This is not the case with this research study. Thus, this research study is closer to the way that the above three moves were used for the analysis of ELF data in Jenkins (2015).

Further to the above, with particular reference to the speakers' use of language items from a variety of linguistic resources which they had available in the course of a single conversation, for the investigation of the pragmatic functions which were thus achieved, elements from Li's (1998) sequential analysis are adopted here. As Li notes, whatever language or language dialect or variety speakers draw from for a conversational turn or part of a turn, impacts on their own subsequent language choices as well as those of their interlocutors.

Likewise, they also have an impact on the relationship between the interlocutors themselves. To put it differently, Li explains that the analysis should not be on the drawn language items in their own right, by means of an effort to report on

their brought-along meaning. Instead, there should be an investigation of the meaning which is thus created, that is, the brought-about meaning. This way, for instance, there is a look at the subsequent unfolding of the conversation in a way that can reveal whether the items which the speakers draw are accepted and ratified by the interlocutors, or whether the interlocutors rejected them or let them pass. This is something which is followed in the analysis of the extracts in the subsequent analytical chapters too, as there is not only report on the language items which the speakers draw from the linguistic resources which they have available, but also significant investigation of their conversational implications.

3.3.2. Data collection

3.3.2.1. Naturally occurring spoken discourse

This previous sections elaborate on the overarching conceptual considerations and the theoretical framework of this study. Thereafter, a variety of practical decisions had to be taken as well, and this is the focus of this section. To illustrate better the difference between the previous sections and this one, an example can be used. In the previous sections, successful ELF communication is discussed and also it is justified as the kind of linguistic data which this study chooses to look at. In this section, successful ELF communication is discussed from the perspective of what particular data of this kind were chosen, from whom, where, and why. As it is shown below, what was chosen was naturally

occurring spoken discourse from meetings of non-native international students at the University of London who at that time were trying to establish an international student society at their student union. In addition to justifying the decisions which had to be made with reference to the choices about collecting specific kind of data, from a specific group of speakers, in a specific context, this section also provides some justifications as to why some other options were avoided.

An option which was initially considered but subsequently avoided had to do with whether various English language corpora would be appropriate for the purposes of this study. As discussed at different points of this study earlier on, English is the language which the vast majority of people who come from different linguacultural backgrounds employ more than any other language in the world nowadays in order to communicate in a variety of personal and professional domains and contexts. Various features of this communication have been investigated thanks to the large number of corpora. In particular, with reference to the interaction between non-native speakers of English, there is for instance the 'International Corpus of Learner English' ('ICLE'), the 'Cambridge Learner Corpus' ('CLC'), the 'Longman Learners' Corpus' ('LLC'), the 'Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Corpus of Learner English' ('HKUST Corpus'), the 'Chinese Learner English Corpus' ('CLEC'), the 'Japanese Learner of English Corpus' ('JLE'), and the 'Standard Speaking Test Corpus' ('SST Corpus'), to name but a few. Some of them are multimillion-word corpora, such as the ICLE, some are based on interactions in specific

geographical regions, such as the CLEC, and some focus on one or the other language skill, such as the SST. The major argument which could have been put forward in favour of the use of these corpora has to do with what is often mentioned as the main strength of corpora in general. That is, corpora are sometimes believed to be ideal for language studies, in so far as the language data which they offer is deemed to be 'real' and 'authentic' (see e.g. Hunston 2002). This is so, because corpora comprise language data which have usually occurred with minimal experimental interference, in natural contexts, and is thus organised in field-collected samples (*ibid.*). This being the case, some corpora could have provided a readily available and extensive body of linguistic data to be analysed for the purposes of this study.

However, all the above corpora are learner corpora (cf. McCarthy 1998, Sinclair 1991). For instance, 'learner' is mentioned in the title of all of them, apart from the SSTC but its focus is on tests of English learners too. In addition to their title, the 'learner' element is also obvious in their focus. To illustrate this with an example, the website of 'Cambridge Learner English' explicitly mentions that its focus is on "how learners use English" (*ibid.*). In learner corpora, the data are collected in order to help researchers compare and contrast various linguistic aspects such as accuracy and fluency in the language of native and non-native speakers, in this case, non-native speakers of English. That is, the focus of researchers who use learner corpora is on the manifestations of what are seen as linguistic 'deviations' in the way that non-natives use English as opposed to the English of the native speakers. What this means is that the ENL norms

remain the default quality yardstick, whereas the non-native use of English is considered from a linguistic deficit perspective, and in turn the non-native participants in these corpora are regarded as deficient language learners and not as language users in their own right who may communicate effectively using the English language. A characteristic example of this focus, the website of 'Longman Learner's Corpus' explains that its purpose is to provide information about "the mistakes which students make" (ibid.).

However, one could wonder whether the above learner corpora could still be used for the purposes of this research study, if I as the researcher could adopt different views as well. Still, I would say that learner corpora could not have been used in this study, because they predominantly comprise linguistic interactions of non-native speakers who are at the early stages of their language development (cf. McCarthy 1998, Sinclair 1991). On the other hand, this study is about non-native users of English who manage to use English successfully in order to communicate with other English users from different linguacultural backgrounds, as it is discussed above. In addition, some of the learner corpora feature only participants coming from a single one linguistic background, such the 'Chinese Learner English Corpus' and the 'Japanese Learner of English Corpus'. This negates their eligibility for this ELF-related study, since ELF interactions by definition include participants who come from more than one linguistic background, and that is why they use English as a common and shared language for communication.

Since this is the case as regards learner corpora, it was also examined whether this study could make use of ELF-specific corpora, such as VOICE, ELFA, SELF, TELF and ELFIA, which are mentioned in the literature review in Chapter 1. For one thing, ELF-specific corpora would be more appropriate for this study than the previous learner corpora, in so far as the participants would not be at the early stages of their English language development, but instead they would be using English successfully in order to achieve their communicative objectives. However, as it was conceded earlier on, it is not easy to pin down the point that a language speaker passes from the status of the language learner to the status of the language user, and this could become obvious in these corpora too. For instance, some of the linguistic interactions in VOICE are taken from travel agencies, which non-native customers were visiting in order to book a trip or to make enquiries for that matter. This being the case, it could not have been ensured that these customers' English would have been sufficient enough for the purposes of their interactions and in turn for the purposes of this study too. Also, since the travel agencies of VOICE were based in Austria, at least one aspect of the interaction, the travel agents, would most likely be of Austrian linguacultural background, and this would not have offered a representative sample for this study. The same would be the case with the Finland-based ELFA and SELF corpora, the German-based TELF corpus, and the ELFIA corpus in Hong Kong too.

In addition, the purposes of this study would not be served because of some of the indispensable weaknesses of corpora in general. For instance, the corpora

which feature spoken communication do so by providing a transcription of what was previously uttered. In that case, the weakness lies in the fact that the transcription alone, no matter how laborious it is, cannot do justice to what is supposed to represent (O'Connell, Cowal and Cowal 1993). In the same vein, a corpus transcription cannot grasp the concomitant paralinguistic and extralinguistic dimension of interaction in face-to-face communication. That is, it does not include the subtleties of the prosodic and intonational features of language, nor the facial expressions, the hand gestures, and the rest of the body language of the interactants (see more about meaning-making from a multimodal perspective in e.g. Jewitt 2009, Kress 2010 and van Leeuwen 2005). What is more with reference to using corpora, there would be the danger that a corpus might discontinue or would get monetised, and thus it would not be available or affordable anymore for this study. Such an outcome would not attend to the fundamental concern for continuous access to the investigated data while a study takes place (similar concerns are discussed in e.g. Bryman 2012). It is for these reasons that even the existing ELF-related corpora were not considered appropriate for the purposes of the research focus and questions of this study.

At the same time, drawing on my own background as a student who at that time was living in one of the intercollegiate halls of residence of the University of London, with more than one hundred non-native students-residents coming from more than fifty different countries or areas and speaking various different languages too, I explored the possibility to see whether these fellow residents

and their daily interactions at my hall would be sufficient for this study. From my personal experience, I knew that the hall provided an environment which went beyond the characterisation of a community of practice regarding the fostering and development of social relationships (Barton and Tusting 2005), notably due to the fact that it is a catered hall and the students meet at the restaurant twice a day for their breakfast and dinner, and also thanks to its common rooms such as the student bar and the various social events organised there. All these would provide a great variety of opportunities for me to collect data.

However, this option was also abandoned for many reasons. For instance, while it is true that various students would be meeting and spending time with one another, it would be impossible for me to orchestrate a systematic data collection process by joining groups of fellow residents, explaining to them my study and trying to persuade them to take part in it, asking them to read and sign the consent forms, and then allowing them to continue their conversation while I would be present audio-recording them. Also, if a group of friends in the hall had been found in advance and they had agreed to take part in this study, it is not sure that it would be practical for me to be informed on a short notice that they would meet, so that I could join them to audio-record them. Likewise, it is not sure that leaving my audio-recorder with them would ensure that they would always agree and remember to use it to audio-record their conversations. In addition, it would impossible to exclude any other hall residents from joining the audio-recorded group, talking to them, and so on, all the more so as these conversations would be taking part in some of the hall's common rooms.

Further to the above, there was a problem of an ethical nature. As de Laine (2000) notes, there is a potential conflict and tension between the naturalistic ethnographic researcher *qua* researcher and friend, and his human participants. This would perhaps as well turn out to be the case with this group of fellow residents of my study, since many of them would be friends of mine already and I would be living in the same hall of residence with them. After all, this is how I would have known them and have employed them for the purposes of this study in the first place.

After this option was abandoned too, there was another data collection opportunity, which was eventually the one that was utilised for this study. Through my personal contacts, I became aware that a group of international students at the University of London would soon start holding meetings in order to establish an international student society at the student union of the university. I managed to find the contact details of the student who seemed to be the head of this effort and to persuade him to let me attend the meetings of his society. In that sense, access was granted to me through him as the gatekeeper of my fieldwork and my data collection process therein. As he was contacting students to persuade them to come to the meetings which was organising, he was mentioning me and my study too. As I had advised him, he was clarifying to the new members that I will be present audio-recording and taking some notes only during few of the meetings, he was confirming that my study is interested only in the way that non-native students communicate using English and not in what the topic of their conversations is, as well as that their

names and any other combination of information which would lead to the identification of their identity would never be revealed to anyone else outside these meetings. These meetings were always taking place in public places, such as the café of the University of London student union and Senate House (i.e. the administrative centre of the University of London), and even a common room in my hall of residence which was once booked for that matter.

3.3.2.2. Participants and site of the research, and complementary data sources

In total, I attended and audio-recorded the first five meetings of the student society, collecting more than seven hours of naturally occurring spoken discourse, from more than ten international students coming from various countries and areas and from various language backgrounds, which ranged from Greek to Turkish to Cantonese to Mandarin Chinese to Mauritian Creole and so on. The first meetings started with a few students, but they were becoming more and more populated as the society seemed to be gaining momentum and to be getting popular. At that point, the amount of hours of the audio-recordings and the variety in terms of students' linguacultural backgrounds seemed enough for the purposes of this study. In that sense, it could be said that I began with a convenience sample (Patton 1989), which later started snowballing, and I stopped when I thought that the participants had provided me with the average typical cases which I expected to come across

and with some unusual cases which I did not expect (see more about when to consider the collected data sufficient in e.g. Patton *ibid.*).

Also, spoken discourse is evanescent when it comes to research studies, as Cameron (2001) notes, and as such I tried to treat it as carefully as possible. For instance, particular attention was paid to the audio-recorder which was used. Thus, all the meetings were audio-recorded using an Olympus VN-8100 digital audio-recorder and a Yoga BM-26D omnidirectional bounded microphone, both of which are considered relatively technologically high-end equipment when it comes to audio-recordings, considering the purpose of this study. In turn, they were digitalised automatically using the Adobe Audition v.1.5 software, and transcribed using the Logografos v.1.0 software as much as possible but manual editing was necessary at points too. This process was taking place immediately after each meeting or at least as soon as possible, so that the recency of the event would not be a problem (e.g. Gilovich, Griffin and Kahneman 2002). This way, in case something was unclear in the audio-recordings, perhaps I could recall it or I could contact the student who uttered it and could discern it better than me. Video recordings were not used for two reasons. First, because the presence of a video camera might have jeopardised the naturalistic aspect needed here, at least more than what the audio-recorder and the microphone were already doing so. Second, because the focus of my research was on meaning-making through language and not through other semiotic modes, such as body movements, facial expressions or hand gestures, Thus, the affordances of video-recordings, which could have captured all these

(e.g. Erickson 1996, 2004), would not be of any particular use for the purposes of my study.

Traditional transcription conventions (e.g. Schiffrin 1994) were not used. Such conventions were developed mainly for the transcription of spoken discourse occurring in L1 settings. Instead, what was needed here was a transcription system devised for representing the characteristic features of the spoken discourse of ELF-mediated interactions. To this end, I used some of the transcription conventions which were devised by the VOICE team for the purposes of their project. However, two adaptations were made to suit my study purposes better. The first one is that transcription symbols to mark the pronunciation variations are not used, as my focus was not in pronunciation. The second is that I do not name or number the speakers as S1, S2 and so on, but instead I use pseudonyms. However, to signal the speakers' gender and sociocultural background, the pseudonym chosen was not random, but of the same gender as their original name, as well as a name commonly found in the respective sociocultural background. This gave a more realistic 'flavour' of the participants and their meetings, without breaching any confidentiality (for similar transcription-related considerations of ELF-mediated interactions see e.g. Dewey 2007a).

In addition to audio-recording the meetings of the society, while I was attending them, as I mention above, I made more than ten pages of field notes. Instead of taking these notes on a blank sheet, I was taking them on the agenda item

sheet which was given in the beginning of each meeting to all the students-participants. This way, my notes were 'anchored' more closely on the actual thematic unfolding of each meeting (e.g. Emerson, Fretz and Shaw 1995). In turn, this way, what I noted down made more sense when I had to revisit the meetings' audio-recordings and the transcriptions for the purposes of the subsequent analytical chapters, something which I knew that would take place even many months after the actual meetings. These notes usually related to various technicalities of the meetings, such as when a participant was leaving the room for a few minutes. On other occasions, some characteristic and intense extra-linguistic features of the students during their conversation were noted too, such as when some participants had to reply to texts on their mobiles. These features, important in human communication as they are, did not seem to be associated with the data analysis and findings, which provided some more support to the initial decisions that video-recordings were not necessary for the purposes of this study.

In addition to these notes and the decision to 'anchor' them on the agenda of the meetings for ease of recollection during the subsequent stages of the study, other aide-memoirs were also used. The importance of aide-memoirs lies in the fact that they help the researcher recollect during the subsequent stages of the research what took place back then. For instance, Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest debriefing through aide-memoires for reminding the observer-researcher of the main types of information and events after leaving the scene. To this end, in this study, a still photo was always taken at each meeting. As

some participants sometimes had to arrive late or to leave early, taking a photo in the beginning or at the end of the meeting would not be ideal, since some of them would be missing from it. Instead, a photo was taken at some point half way down the meeting, usually when they were deciding that they wanted to take break for a while, so that everyone would be still present and thus would be in the photo too. This ensured my recollection of the scene of the meeting, and thus contributed to my better understanding of the interactions of participants.

Also, in order to allow for more in-depth insights in the meetings of the student society, and in turn in order build up the trustworthiness of the research findings (Denzin 2006), the naturally occurring spoken discourse from the meetings which were audio-recorded and the notes and still photos which were taken, were complemented with other data. Specifically, they were complemented with post-event interviews which were conducted with some of the participants (Silverman 2001). The strength of such interviews lies in the fact that they extensively corroborate many of my initial findings, or when they challenged my findings this provided me with the opportunity to sharpen my analytical focus and to see clearer what I was looking at and in turn what was yielded. With reference to the actual process of these post-event interviews, as my research focus was on the pragmatic functions which the students were achieving in their interactions, as it is shown below, I was interested in hearing what they themselves had to say regarding these particular stretches of discourse in which I discerned that such a pragmatic function was achieved and in which

they themselves were featuring. Thus, prior to these interviews, the students were emailed the audio file and the transcription of this stretch of discourse so that they could remind themselves of these interactions and also this way they could also start preparing themselves for our interview, and I also had these two available when we were meeting and our interview was taking place. These interviews comprised of questions which I tried to make precise, clear, motivating and open-ended so as to elicit the entire gamut of verbalisation of the informants' thoughts or at least as much as possible of them (Patton 1989), while at the same time they were semi-structured allowing me to probe beyond any pre-arranged topics (Berg 1989). These post-event interviews deemed sufficient regarding the answers to the questions which I was seeking, and thus no questionnaires were given to the participants (cf. Dörnyei 2005).

Further to the above, and since I knew that this research study would take place over a quite substantial amount of time, I also asked the members of the society who participated in my study to keep a diary (Bryman 2012). Although the diary certainly added a longitudinal aspect to my research too (*ibid.*), its main advantage was that the students used it to take notes which had to do with some of the issues which we raised in our post-event interviews. For instance, when we were discussing particular pragmatic functions which I discerned in the students' naturally occurring spoken discourse and which I had named in a particular way, I was asking them, if possible and if they wanted, to use their diary to record similar instances of this pragmatic function in other interactions in their daily activities, or perhaps to find a more accurate name for the

pragmatic functions under question. In turn, sometimes they contacted me for that matter, or they were updating me the next time that we were meeting, and they were letting me know regarding what they had noted down. In that sense, I tried to make my participants ethnographers too, in Roberts et al.'s words (2001). Although these notes of theirs were not part of the body of data which I investigated per se, I always found them useful while I was trying to understand more about the discerned pragmatic functions, or while I was trying to refine the name which I had given to them.

In addition to what the students were noting down on their diaries regarding their linguistic practices, I was trying to find opportunities to spend some more time with them in order to see these linguistic practices of theirs in action. For instance, at some point I showed them the area around University of London's Senate House, at another point I walked with some of them from Senate House to the nearest tube station, I also followed the president a few times when he had to go meet some officers at the students union regarding some queries about their society, and so on. In particular, I was trying to find opportunities to do some sort of naturalistic observations of the students. Naturalistic observations give the researchers the opportunity to gather authentic information about participants and social situations which occur naturally. They also reveal processes which are sometimes below the level of consciousness of the participants, and thus they could not have been reported otherwise (Bailey 1994). In a sense, then, elements from Malinowski's (1967) "off the verandah" empirical naturalistic approach were followed here, in so far as I was interested

in experiencing the everyday life of my participants, in order to understand how they operate in their contexts as social beings.

It is also worth noting that, in the way that my understanding of the naturally occurring spoken discourse which I had audio-recorded and the pragmatic functions which I had discerned was developing, this was also helped due to my personal past recollections, being an international student myself too. Although it is difficult to pin down specific instances for which my background knowledge and experiences were useful for that matter, in retrospect I could say that the help might have been provided all along the way of setting up the study, and collecting data and analysing them. In addition, contribution from my personal background was also made when I had to analyse some stretches of discourse in which one of the Greek students who was a member of the student society drew some Greek lexis from his Greek-L1 and had used it in the English conversations with his fellow members of the student society. Overall, then, I built on the growing tradition of applied linguistics research to capitalise on personal experiences in addition to collecting data from others or considering others' accounts. For instance, Denzin (1999) discusses a wide variety of benefits from researchers' autobiographies, and Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) characterised such data sources as a rich and legitimate heuristic means for a variety of language investigations. It should also be made explicit that I did not treat these data methods as data triangulation (cf. Denzin 2006). Data triangulation has to do with using at least two data collection methods in order to 'double-check' the issue under investigation. However, rather differently,

here, all these were just complementing one another in order all together to constitute a more powerful analytical toolkit, something which would not have been the case if there had been an adoption of only one of these research methods, whichever one this would have been.

Last but not least, I think that one more note is worth making here. It is mentioned above that the only kind of complementation of data which took place for the purposes of this study is through the post-event interviews with the students, their notes on their own linguistic practices, my notes on them too, as well as through recalling some of my own personal and relevant experiences. In the literature on data collection and analysis, something widely mentioned is bringing together not only other methods of data collection but also other peers to help with the data analysis (e.g. Marshal and Rossman 1999). However, peers were not a good idea for the purposes of this study. This is so, because it would not be sure that other peers would have the background or even the time to engage seriously with the collected data and their analysis so as to make informed comments. After all, it has to be admitted that a research study such as this one is a time-bound project, as well as one which I as the researcher set up as my sole interpretive space. Thus, having to take into consideration peers' views was not sure whether it would be useful, whether it would have certainly been more time-consuming, and thus this option was not exploited.

Given the amount of data collected for the purposes of this study as well as given the aim of this study, I was able to adopt an analytical approach all along

the continuum from broad to narrow (cf. Heath 1983). In the former case, I would analyse as much of the collected data as possible, but at the expense of depth, in the sense that the analysis would not be elaborate enough. In the latter case, I would focus on a smaller body of data, but the analysis would be very detailed. For instance, such detailed analysis could draw significantly on the analytic apparatus of conversation analysis, and it could show exactly how conversation analytic tools and techniques were applied to the analysis of the extracts which were considered worthy of investigation here. However, after consideration of the purposes of this study, as well as considering its length and timeframe, I would say that a medium approach was adopted (*ibid.*). In other words, although there are references to all the sources of the collected data, the actual body of data which was chosen to be analysed could be considered somewhat medium in terms of its amount.

What is also important in an analysis of this kind is coding. Miles and Huberman (1984) observe that the data analysis approach which is adopted in a study should ideally determine when the coding should start taking place. This was taken into consideration in the data analysis for this study too, but with a small adjustment. What this means is that, considering the fact that a medium approach was adopted here and also considering the fact that this study was accountable to various external quality controls, such as departmental reviews, it was decided that the coding would not start mid-point of the research timeframe but it would 'culminate' there. Thus, in the initial stages of this research, it was primarily the research questions and the hunch which I had

which were rather ‘imposed’, as it were, on my data, and which guided their subsequent analysis (see more about this ‘imposition’ in e.g. Goetz and LeCompte 1984, and Powney and Watts 1987). However, subsequently, when a clearer idea was emerging regarding the findings which were being yielded, some inductive content analysis (Silverman 2001) also started and it culminated around the mid-point of the research timeframe too. In doing so, I tried to identify and describe the recurrent themes and other salient issues which I felt that they constituted answers to my research questions (Bogdan and Biklen 1992). As mentioned above, and as discussed in the subsequent analytical chapters below, the findings have to do with the features of discourse which were discerned in the extracts of the meetings of the students who participated in my research study, and in particular with the pragmatic functions which were found to be achieved in their ELF-mediated interactions.

3.4. Summary

This chapter first discusses the conceptual considerations and the theoretical framework within which this study took place. Specifically, it discusses that this study does not see the variation in the language use of non-native speakers of English as ENL deficiency but as ELF difference, themselves as ELF users and not as ENL learners, and finally their interactions as successful ELF communication and not as failed ENL discourse. After that, it goes through a variety of key aspects with reference to the overall research design and the data

collection and analysis process. In particular, it explains why for the purposes of this study a naturalistic interpretive qualitative research approach is employed. In the same vein, it explains why particular elements from the research traditions of ethnography and conversation analysis were adopted, in so far as the consideration of the context of the investigated interactions is combined with a detailed focus on the moment-by-moment unfolding of these interactions. Subsequently, it goes on to justify why it was sufficient to collect data comprising naturally occurring spoken discourse from non-native international students at the University of London, who were holding meetings so as to establish an international student society at their student union. It also justifies why, in addition to the audio-recordings of the naturally occurring spoken discourse from the students' meetings, taking notes during these meetings, and other notes of the students' linguistic practices outside these meetings which I or they were taking, as well as conducting post-event interviews with some of these students, were also found useful during the data analysis process. All the above led to four analytical chapters. In line with the pragmatic character of this study, each of these chapters discusses a pragmatic function, which was discerned to be achieved in the students' meetings and which is usually broken down in two more sub-functions. The chapter which follows is about the way that students were using translanguaging and they were thus making specific meaning.

CHAPTER 4.

MAKING SPECIFIC MEANING THROUGH TRANSLANGUAGING

4.1. Introduction

This chapter looks at the naturally occurring spoken discourse from the society meetings of the international students who participated in this research study, with the aim to discuss instances whereby the students were setting out to make specific meaning while they were using English as a common and shared language of communication. In particular, it looks at how the students were translanguaging, that is, how they were making flexible use of the entire gamut of their available linguistic resources by drawing extensively from them, and how they were thus achieving various communicative functions. Speakers' flexible language use whereby they draw linguistic elements from various linguistic resources which they have available has come to be known under various terms, such as 'code-switching', 'translanguaging', and so on, and this chapter starts with a discussion of the most widely used of them. It also explains why the term 'translanguaging' was used instead of another one. Then, it moves on to the instances of the students' translanguaging in the investigated meetings. In doing so, the ensuing analysis of the data reveals that the students were thus achieving the pragmatic function '*making specific meaning*', which appears in the title of this chapter. This function is broken down into two sub-functions, '*filling in a lexical gap*' and '*using some more precise lexis*'.

4.2. Outlining the relevant concepts and notions

When people interact with one another, some sort of meaning-making activity has to take place, if it is for them to share information, express wants and desires, reach agreements and conclusions, and so on. It is not an overstatement to say that a key element of this meaning-making activity, and in turn a key element of people's interactions too, is language. Surely, there is a wide variety of interrelated and intertwined meaning-making modes, which may be individually or collectively tapped on for that matter, and which may be para-linguistic or extra-linguistic, such as facial expressions, hand gestures, bodily movements and stances, and many more (see e.g. Kress 2010, Kress and van Leeuwen 2006, van Leeuwen and Jewitt 2001). However, considering the scope of this research study, the investigated focus will remain on language. The understanding of the role of the language-related elements in people's meaning-making activities and interactions is nowadays even less straightforward and thus even more necessary to investigate, in so far as very often people come from ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds when they come together to make meaning and interact. Then, these meaning-making activities and interactions of theirs constitute opportunities regarding the usage and use of more than one language or language dialect or variety out of all these ones which the people may know according to their background. The aim of this chapter is to shed some more light at the understanding of the role of all these linguistic resources of the speakers during their meaning making activities

and interactions, from the perspective of what is used, in what way, on which occasion, and for which reason.

Research so far has extensively shown that in ethnolinguistically diverse interactions there may be noticed a wide range of linguistic items which the speakers draw from their available languages or language dialects and varieties (see e.g. the classic work of Fishman 1965; Gumperz 1964, 1967, 1973, 1982; Poplack 1980; Weinreich 1953). One of the first terms which was used for this phenomenon was 'code-switching' (Vogt 1954). However, because Auer (1998) goes through a variety of terms which have been put forward to describe this phenomenon, including 'code switching', in an often cited and comprehensive way, it is his terminological analysis will be used for this purposes of this section. As Auer (ibid.) explains, code-switching occurs in a conversation which primarily takes place in a single one language or language dialect or variety, but at times speakers depart from them and use other ones. For instance, in a conversation taking place in English, speakers may depart from English, draw some words or phrases or expressions from their mother tongues, and then use them back in the conversation which they were holding in English. In that sense, code-switching differs from the borrowing of specific scientific or every day loanwords from other languages, such as *bazaar*, *café* and *déjà vu*.

While the term 'code-switching' refers to speakers' sparse shift from one 'dominant' linguistic code to another one, as it was mentioned above, there are various interrelated terms. For instance, as Auer (ibid.) notes, the term

‘language mixing’ suggests speakers’ drawing from their linguistic resources in such an extensive way that a new hybrid linguistic code is brought about. In other words, language mixing is similar to the creation of pidgins, with the difference that pidgins are created by speakers who do not share a common and shared language, whereas language mixing occurs in settings where speakers may share one or more than one language. In a similar vein, the term ‘code-fusion’ has to do with such a systematic and extensive mixture of two or more linguistic codes in the course of a single conversation that the fused lect which is formed is almost fully grammaticalised (ibid.). The above terms are mainly used to show alterations between linguistic items at the lexical level and usually only in oral interactions. With some sort of socio-political orientation and agenda in mind, Canagarajah (2011a), focusing on English and uses the term ‘code meshing’ to refer to the practice of combining local, colloquial, vernacular, and international varieties of English, in everyday conversations and even in formal written assignments of pupils, in so far as through this practice some kind of linguistic resistance against the spread of English can take place, as he argues.

In addition, the ‘Common European Framework of Reference for Languages’ (CEFR) argues in favour of the term ‘plurilingualism’ (Council of Europe 2000). According to it, plurilingualism aims at moving beyond multilingualism as the presence of many languages in the mind of individual or in a society, such as in the case of French, Dutch and German in Belgium. What it emphasises is the fact that people develop language knowledge and skills in more than one

language at the same time. For instance, their linguistic repertoire may expand from the language or languages of their home to the languages of their school or social environment. Quite similarly, Jacquemet (2005) speaks of ‘transidiomatic practices’, according to which transnational groups simultaneously use different codes in a variety of local and distant channels to communicate with one another. With regard to the cognitive orientation to competence of these speakers when compared to monolinguals, it was shown that bilingualism and multilingualism do not equate with double or multiple monolingualism, but instead they are dynamic practices whereby language codes are “adjusting to the multilingual multimodal terrain of the communicative act” (García 2009: 53).

Further to the above, research has started taking a more critical stance against talking about shuttling between linguistic codes, and instead talking about resources which make up one’s linguistic repertoire. For that matter, as Makoni and Pennycook (2006: 2) note, “languages do not exist as real entities in the world”. In a similar vein, Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen and Møller (2011: 23) add that “[languages] are abstractions, they are sociocultural or ideological constructions which match real-life use of language poorly”. More specifically, Blommaert explains that, “[p]eople do not use ‘Languages’, they use resources for communication, driven by concerns of effect, and deployed in practices of languaging (‘doing’ language)... The collective resources available to anyone at any point in time are a repertoire” (2013: 4) (cf. the notion of communicative repertoires in e.g. Rymes 2014). In such a frame, ‘crossing’ was used to

describe speakers' linguistic items which are usually found in the repertoire of other groups of speakers in order to signal some kind of affiliation with them (Rampton 1995). For instance, white teenagers in urban settings may use African-American English speech markers in order to show some kind of affiliation with the hip-hop culture associated with these groups and their members. Or, Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen and Møller opt for the term 'polylingualism' to highlight the fact "language users employ whatever linguistic features are at their disposal to achieve their communicative aims as best they can" (p. 34).

Many more have used the term 'translanguaging'. 'Translanguaging' was first coined by Williams (1994) in Welsh as 'trawsieithu'. This term initially referred to the pedagogic practice whereby school pupils were found to use linguistic items from all across their linguistic repertoire so as to go about their receptive and productive language activities, such as to read and write. In other words, pupils accessed different linguistic items from the entire range of what would be traditionally seen as individual codes corresponding to their respective individual named languages or language dialects and varieties, such as Cantonese and Mandarin Chinese, Punjabi, and Polish. In other words, translanguaging lamented the language education which aimed at the development of languages as compartmentalised linguistic systems, and argues for the legitimisation and validation of this practice or process, in so far as pupils thus maximised their communicative potential. Subsequently, translanguaging opened up to various other domains and settings of language use (see e.g. the

rich body of work in Creese and Blackledge 2010; Garcia and Li 2014; Li and Zhu 2010; Lin 2006, 2012). It continues to postulate that speakers may alter between what traditionally would be seen as different language codes in order for them to communicate effectively with their interlocutors. In doing so, they build up a communicative competence by means of a linguistic repertoire in which all their language knowledge and skills interrelate and interact (ibid.). Interestingly enough, the term ‘translanguaging’ was also used by Canagarajah (e.g. 2011b), but subsequently he argued that its key scholars rather research it as a product, whereas he prefers to look at it as a process, and he subsequently opted for the term ‘translingualism’ (e.g. 2013).

A quite recent term is also ‘metrolingualism’ (Otsuiji and Pennycook 2010). ‘Metrolingualism’ is used to refer to the practice of the creative combination or other creative use of a wide array of different linguistic resources, in a way that transcends the established boundaries of culture, social and political life, and history. What is characteristic with reference to metrolingualism is the fact that it is used to refer to contemporary urban settings and contexts, and in particular to look at the way that language contributes to visual arts, such as graffiti and logos or signs, from a wider linguistic landscape perspective. As Otsuiji and Pennycook explain, “[metrolingualism] does not assume connections between language, culture, ethnicity, nationality or geography” (p. 246), and with reference to the prefix ‘metro’, they add that it “is the productive space provided by, though not limited to, the contemporary city to produce new language identities” (p. 247). It could be said that this resembles Jaworski’s (2015)

‘globalese’, as a new universal visual-linguistic register, in urban settings around the world.

In the linguistic practices and processes which the above terms refer to, there is a common denominator. All of them show that, when speakers from different linguacultural backgrounds interact, they may depart from the initially used language in their conversation and they may draw linguistic items from their mother tongues or from the other languages or language dialects and varieties which they developed later in their lives or which they know that they are used by their interlocutors, even if they have limited knowledge and experience of them, and they may use them back in their conversations. In other words, the terms above refer to practices which show that linguistic codes are not decompartmentalised from one another, but instead language users can make use of all their available language resources all across their language repertoire in the course of a single interaction. What this means is that language usage and use is quintessentially flexible in nature. For the purposes of a term to be used in this chapter as well as in the rest of this research study for that matter, ‘translanguaging’ is used here, because it seems to me that it is closer to what was identified here as well as it seems to me that it is a more overarching term which could include the scope of the other related terms too.

Beside the discussion of this flexible language practice from the perspective of which term to use to refer to it, there have also been discussions from the perspective of the language items which may be or may not be utilised for that

matter. This has most notably taken place the framework of code-switching. For instance, Poplack (1983) postulates that code-switching is subject to two constraints. The first one is the free-morpheme constraint, according to which code-switching occurs between a lexical stem and bound morphemes, as opposed to the borrowed loanwords. The second one is the equivalence constraint, according to which code-switching occurs only when the language surface structure coincides, or when the sentence elements occur in identical or similar ways in the respective grammars of the languages in question. In addition, Myers-Scotton's (1993) Matrix Language-Frame model posits that there is Matrix Language, which corresponds to the speaker's mother tongue and whose elements are inserted into the Embedded Language, which corresponds to the 'dominant' language of the conversation. Finally, MacSwan (2000) posits a constraint-free approach to the analysis of code-switching, whereby the only constraints are the constraints of the mixed grammars of the involved languages. As it becomes obvious, the above models see languages as separate linguistic codes. In addition, they are more interested in investigating the restrictions of code-switching rather than finding which constituents are switched and why. However, as it is explained above, the take on flexible language use in this research study does not adhere on a view on languages as decompartmentalised and objectified entities. Also, as it is shown below, a wider range of features is discerned in the instances of translanguaging of this analytical chapter.

Another issue which is also extensively discussed is the reasons of this flexible language use. A traditional view about it is that speakers code-switch when they do not know a word or expression from the language in which they interact, and thus they have to resort to another language in order to make up for this linguistic deficiency. One of the reasons because of which this assumption was put forward is that some research studies found that young children use their available linguistic resources this way more than older children. For that matter, they suggest that these children are still in the process of learning the language from which they depart and have to depend on the language which they know in order to access the language items they need (see e.g. McClure 1981 and Zentella 1997). Whereas this may be true at times, it cannot constitute a comprehensive account of all the reasons due to which language is used in a flexible way. After all, as it is explained above, this study does not draw a line between language learners and users, as well as it does not see languages as separate codes in the minds of individuals. In addition, it is shown below that this flexible language use is a legitimate language practice and is motivated by a variety of various functional-pragmatic objectives.

Flexible language using is also discussed from the perspective of its sequential implications. For instance, as Li (1998) explains, whatever language of language dialect or variety speakers choose to use in a conversational turn, or part of a turn, and whatever items are code-switched, this impacts on the subsequent language choices of the speakers themselves as well as their interlocutors. Likewise, there is also an impact on the relationship between the

interlocutors. Thus, Li argues that, instead of concentrating the analysis on the chosen language items in their own right, that is, trying to report on the brought-along meaning, there should be investigation of the meaning which the flexible language use creates, that is, the brought-about meaning. This is important, in so far as it is only by looking at the subsequent unfolding of the conversation that it can be found whether a speaker's chosen item was accepted and ratified by the interlocutors, or whether the interlocutors rejected it or let it pass. This is something which is taken up in the analysis of the extracts in this research study too, and there is due attention not only to the chosen language items which were found to be used flexibly but also to their conversational implications. In a way, Li's viewpoint here echoes Seidlhofer's (2009a) call not for spotting and reporting on language features in their own right but for investigation of their pragmatic significance, which is what led to the functional-pragmatic orientation of this research study too, as discussed in the literature review.

In sum, flexible language use and the way it sees the speakers' practice of drawing linguistic elements from the entire gamut of their linguistic repertoire differs fundamentally from the linguistic deficit perspective which many EFL or SLA researchers adopt when they discuss the same practice. It also does not restrict its scope on what cannot be used flexibly, but it postulates that there is the chance for flexible language use across the entire range of the language resources of the speakers. Finally, it tries to pay due attention to the sequential implications for the conversation too. Thus, the perspective on flexible language

use taken here is more in line with the other ELF research studies on this issue. For instance, as Jenkins (2011) explains, speakers of English who shuttle between the languages which they know are not failed native English speakers and they do not have any linguistic deficiency because of which they have to find ways to compensate. Instead, they are skilled communicators who make full use of all their available linguistic resources in order to enhance their communicative potential and to achieve their communicative objectives. In doing so, the strategic use of all their linguistic resources is a manifestation of their communicative competence.

Thus understood, flexible language use in interactions between speakers from different linguacultural backgrounds is found to contribute to a variety of pragmatic functions which speakers set out to fulfil in their communicative encounters. For instance, it helps speakers address particular interlocutors. This is noted when interlocutors 'depart' from the language which they use until a particular point, and they use the language of the particular interlocutor whom they want to address (Klimpfinger 2007). Also, through lexis drawn from their mother tongues, speakers project their linguacultural identities, for instance, by using this lexis to highlight their association with a particular mother tongue and thus with a particular ethnic group too (Pölzl 2003). In addition, this innovative use of language includes speakers' strategic moves to exploit redundancy and to enhance prominence in their utterances (Cogo 2007, 2012; Cogo and Dewey 2006, 2012; Dewey 2007, 2011), to increase clarity (Pitzl, Breiteneder and Klimpfinger 2008, Ranta 2006), or to increase the semantic transparency of

their arguments (Seidlhofer 2009b). On the interpersonal level of interactions, through flexible language use, speakers establish rapport with their interlocutors too (Kordon 2006), or express solidarity with them especially in cases when they use a lexical item which they draw from their interlocutors' languages (Cogo 2007). Likewise, this way, speakers create a feeling of shared satisfaction with their interlocutors (Hülmbauer 2007), or just add humour to their conversations (Pitzl 2009).

This chapter aims at building on the research of flexible language use and in particular translanguaging, as this is outlined above, from the perspective of the pragmatic functions which have been found to be thus achieved in ELF-mediated conversations. A caveat which is worth making has to do with the view which is taken here regarding these functions. Some of the studies above report on findings which have to do with pragmatic strategies and other moves. In my view, a strategy is a conscious plan of action in order to achieve an objective. A move is something similar, but may not always be conscious and may not aim at the achievement of an objective. On the other hand, a function equates with the objective which is to be achieved. For instance, in one of the studies mentioned above (Kordon 2006), I would say that the speakers' flexible language use is a strategy or a move which contributes to the achievement of the function of establishing rapport. This take on functions is followed in the subsequent analytical chapters as well. In addition, it should be mentioned here that each time the discerned function appears in the title of the respective

analytical chapter, and for ease of reference it is further broken down to what is named sub-functions.

As mentioned above, the data consist of naturally occurring spoken discourse from meetings of international students who were coming together in order to establish an international student society at the University of London. What follows is some brief clarifications about the data extracts, followed by their analysis. It is also important to mention here that these extracts are not grouped according to the grammatical or other category to which the investigated translanguaged word or phrase or expression belong, for instance, according to whether these are nouns or verbs, or idioms. Instead, as the aim is to discern the pragmatic functions and sub-functions which are achieved each time through students' translanguaging, these are first named and then illustrated through the extracts which are analysed. It should be also noted that the meaning of the words and phrases or expressions below and also the additional information about them were usually provided to me by the students themselves in our post-event interviews, or by other friends or colleagues of mine who were speakers of these languages. Or sometimes I myself was able to find out more about them searching online. In each case, I specify the source of my information. This layout will be followed in the subsequent analytical chapters as well. As it is shown below, the students' translanguaging is found to contribute to the achievement of the pragmatic function '*making specific meaning*', which is further broken down into the pragmatic sub-functions '*filling in a lexical gap*' and '*using some more precise lexis*'. To further support my arguments

regarding the data analysis, I also provide some comments which the students made during our post-event interviews when they heard their respective audio-recording and read the transcription too.

4.3. Filling in a lexical gap

As it is mentioned above, the overarching pragmatic function which is achieved in this analytical chapter through students' translanguaging is '*making specific meaning*'. In particular, this pragmatic function is found to be further broken down into two sub-functions, '*filling in a lexical gap*' and '*using some more precise lexis*'. Both of them are illustrated below through the analysis of various extracts.

4.3.1. 'Diaosi'

(Mandarin Chinese (hanzi): '吊丝' / Approximate meaning: 'average person', 'commoner' / Participants: Arvin - L1 Mauritian Creole, Breno - L1 Portuguese, Eshal - L1 Urdu, Jose - L1 Spanish, Linlin - L1 Mandarin Chinese)

The following interaction of the students takes place in the second meeting of their society, during a discussion about who will represent their society to each college. Linlin, sharing her opinion about the characteristics of the ideal officer for her college, draws from her mother tongue, Mandarin Chinese, and she

emphasises the fact that that she would not like her college's officer to be a *diaosi*. As she explains in our post-event interview, and as I also confirmed with the help of other speakers of Mandarin Chinese, *diaosi* is a person who is average in social skills and who cannot be expected to achieve anything worthwhile in life. It is nowadays also used extensively on online forums and social media among youngsters in Mainland China.

- 1 **Linlin** and you know why? (.)
- 2 because sometimes in all these induction days and freshers fayres
- 3 i see people who approach you and talk to you
- 4 and they're they're bad with what they're doing=
- 5 **Eshal** =yeah you're right=
- 6 **Linlin** =so i wouldn't like someone who can't
- 7 you know
- 8 who can't do this or do that
- 9 (1.2)
- 10 **Arvin** [yeah]
- 11 **Marat** [true]=
- 12 **Linlin** =so I wouldn't like someone who is who is (.)
- 13 ah in china we say ah haha **diaosi**
- 14 (.)
- 15 **Breno** hm?
- 16 **Jose** what?
- 17 **Linlin** oh i mean you know **diaosi** (1.4)
- 18 ah ah in english i think perhaps
- 19 if there is this word=
- 20 **Arvin** =so what's this word? what do you mean?
- 21 **Linlin** **diaosi** (.) someone who is average and normal (1.3)
- 22 who can't do anything can't manage anything (.)
- 23 like good for nothing (.)
- 24 **Arvin** is he someone loser then? =
- 25 **Linlin** =a loser? **diaosi** is not a loser it's not a loser definitely not

- 26 **Jose** is he in spanish we say haha perdedor?
 27 like someone who can't manage things and people
 28 (.)
 29 **Linlin** i don't know this word this language i mean
 30 but nuh it's not what you said (0.2)
 31 you know it's just **diaosi**
 32 **diaosi** and nothing else
 33 (.)
 34 **Arvin** ok↑ i get you↑
 35 no **diaosi** will be selected
 36 and do we all agree no **diaosi** will ever represent the society?=
 37 **Breno** =[ok]
 38 **Jose** [yes]=
 39 **Linlin** =thanks↑
 40 yeah it's better this way no=
 41 **Arvin** =no diaoshi
 42 **Linlin** thanks↑

Linlin (line 13) begins her turn with the filler *ah*, the adverbial *in china*, the verb phrase *we say*, followed by *ah* again, and a double laughter. It may be suggested that she feels that the Mandarin Chinese word which is about to use is not going to be immediately understood by her interlocutors, and therefore she pre-empts the fact that they should pay attention to it. It is important to note here that, when she is asked to explain *dioshi*, as it was expected, her reply (line 17) starts with the interjection *oh*, followed by the discourse markers *I mean* and *you know*, which in turn are followed by a pause. In addition, Linlin (line 18) continues with the filler *ah* uttered twice, followed by the hedges *i think* and *perhaps*. It could be argued that all these suggest some uncertainty on her part. The reason for this uncertainty becomes clear immediately afterwards. Linlin does not use *diaosi* because she does not know or she cannot recall the

equivalent Standard English term. That is why she wonders *if there is this word [in Standard English]* (line 19). Thus, it could be argued that she does not exhibit any kind of linguistic deficiency. In the same vein, she rejects Arvin's attempt to translate *diaosi* as *loser* in English (line 24), and likewise she does not seem satisfied with Jose's attempt to translate *diaosi* in his mother tongue Spanish as *perdedor* (lines 26-27), which also means *loser*. For Linlin, these seem to be enough to make her discontinue her attempts to try to translate *diaosi* any further, and she concludes by emphasising that all that she wanted to say is *just diaosi* (line 31) and *diaosi and nothing else* (line 32).

Subsequently, Arvin speaks for the first time in this extract. His views hold special weight, not only because he has not spoken until this moment, but also because he is the president of the society. His *ok* and *i get you* both in an enthusiastic rising intonation (line 34) rather indicate that he does not need any other clarification. More importantly, he even accommodates to Linlin and uses *diaosi* twice himself too, when he ends the conversation by promising that *no diaosi will be selected* (line 35), and when with his rhetorical question he invites everyone to agree that *no diaosi will ever represent the society* (line 36).

Likewise, Breno with his *ok* (line 37) and Jose with his *yes* (line 38) also indicate their agreement with Arvin, and by extension with the use of *diaosi* in their conversation. Linlin seems to realise this, and her *thanks* in a rising intonation (line 39 and 42) could be interpreted as a signal of her need to thank them. As the analysis of this extract shows, Linlin draws *diaosi* from her mother tongue and uses it in her English conversation with her interlocutors, not motivated by

any linguistic deficiency but because this is the very word which she believes that is able to express what she wants to say. In this way, she manages to express her thought the way that she wants, which she could not do using Standard English only. That is why it is argued here that, in so doing, she achieves to fulfil the pragmatic function '*making specific meaning*' and in particular the sub-function '*filling in a lexical gap*'.

4.3.2. 'Hold zhu'

(Mandarin Chinese: 'hold 住' / Approximate meaning: 'stay strong', 'keep your composure' / Participants: Arvin - L1 Mauritian Creole, Eshal - L1 Urdu, Linlin - L1 Mandarin Chinese)

The discussion in this extract takes place a few moments after the one above, and the topic remains the characteristics of the officer of the society at Linlin's college. This time, Linlin describes how she would like the society's officer to be, and she does so by using the Mandarin Chinese expression *hold zhu*. What is interesting about *hold zhu* is that its first component is the English word 'hold', and the second one is the Mandarin Chinese adjective '住' / 'zhu' ('live').

Altogether, *hold zhu* refers to one's ability to stay strong and to remain calm, and in general to be unaffected by problems and difficulties, as Linlin explained to me in the subsequent interview which we had. She also added that *hold zhu* was first used in the Taiwanese variety show '大学生了没?' / 'Daxuesheng le mei?' ('Are you a university student or not?'), and gradually it also became popular in Mainland China too. As she also pointed out, this expression became

so popular in Mainland China that year that it was added to the Chinese equivalent of Facebook, Renren.

- 1 **Linlin** well (.) for me the officer of a college is (.) like (1.2)
- 2 is like the representative there (.)
- 3 is like the best person someone can get to have there=
- 4 **Eshal** =yeap
- 5 **Linlin** so i would like someone who can
- 6 who can (.) ideally who can (.)
- 7 **hold zhu**
- 8 (1.4)
- 9 **Marat** **hold hold** what? what did you say?
- 10 **Linlin** oh (.) **hold zhu** (.)
- 11 means you know someone who who is good
- 12 who manages to do things
- 13 and and to have people under control
- 14 and people like him and appreciate him (.)
- 15 or something like that
- 16 (1.2)
- 17 **Marat** someone who is (.)
- 18 cool then?
- 19 or amazing? =
- 20 **Linlin** =haha not the second one but not the first either (.)
- 21 yeah something like cool you know (2.0)
- 22 yeah someone cooler than cool
- 23 but not as amazing as amazing
- 24 (4.3)
- 25 **Eshal** hm (.)
- 26 i like this in between (3.1)
- 27 i like it a lot actually
- 28 **Linlin** great↑

Soon after the start of this extract, Linlin expresses her opinion that the officer in her college should be able to *hold zhu* (line 7). This time, Linlin does not use the personal pronoun *we* or the adverbial *in China*, and she does not seem to hesitate before her utterances. Perhaps this is because she used *diaosi* a few turns ago, and it was taken positively by her fellow interlocutors, as it was shown. As *hold zhu* is an unknown expression to Linlin's interlocutors, Marat asks about it (line 9) and Linlin sets out to provide an explanation (lines 10-15). But, as was the case in the previous extract too, this expression cannot be readily rendered into English. Thus, Linlin starts with two short pauses (line 10), the discourse marker *you know* in an intonation which rather shows some hesitation (line 10), she also repeats twice *who* (line 11) and *and* (line 13), as well as she uses the vague *or something like that* (line 15). Marat seems to pick up the difficulty to render *hold zhu* in English, and proposes two related English adjectives, *cool* (line 18) and *amazing* (line 19). However, Linlin quickly latches and responds that *hold zhu* cannot be explained in English with either of these two adjectives (line 20). Then, after a 2.0 second pause (line 21), which gives her the opportunity to think better about the meaning of *hold zhu* and how it has been discussed so far, she explains that someone who is able to *hold zhu* is between *cool* and *amazing*. As she characteristically says, such a person is *cooler than cool* (line 22) but *not as amazing as amazing* (line 23).

Later on, Eshal, after a relatively long pause of 4.3 seconds (line 24), during which she has the opportunity to appraise Linlin's explanation of *hold zhu* and particularly the way she used it to describe someone who is between *cool* and

amazing, seems to support Linlin's choice of *hold zhu*. First, she utters *hm* in an intonation which signals her approval (line 25), then she specifically refers to *hold zhu*'s aspect of expressing something which *cool* and *amazing* cannot, and she seems enthusiastic about it as indicated by her *i like this in between* (line 26) and then by her *i like it a lot actually* (line 27). Finally, again as in the case of *diaosi*, it seems likely that Linlin's *thanks* towards Eshal (line 28) is used to acknowledge the fact that Eshal a while ago showed that she approved and liked *hold zhu*. The point which I try to make here is that, in this extract too, Linlin managed to '*make specific meaning*' and in particular to '*fill in a lexical gap*'. This was achieved by drawing *hold zhu* from her mother tongue, in order to express something particular which could not be done through the Standard English lexis.

Further to my arguments regarding the pragmatic-functional significance of Linlin's instances of flexible language use in these two extract, it is interesting to see what Linlin herself had to say. The extract below is taken from the follow-up post-event interview which I conducted with her, and in which she heard the respective audio-file and read the transcription of the spoken interactions too.

Sometimes in English you just know a word or an expression and you say it. But sometimes you don't know or you don't remember. And then what do you do? I mean you can do a lot of things, explain it with other words, find something similar and many more... But sometimes I have a thought in my mind and I have a word for this thought from my mother language. And I want to express this and only this thought, but in English there is not any word for this thought... If I say

another word, ok, fine, but then I don't express my thought... So, yeah, *diaosi* and *hold zhu*... because it was just this and nothing else, and even the closest English words were very different from what I wanted to say... I didn't expect that the other person knew Chinese, but I was sure that we could communicate, he would ask me and I would tell him. This is better than not expressing exactly your thought or not speaking at all.

(Linlin)

In her comments, Linlin seems to be very conscious of her linguistic choices and what she achieves through them. In particular, with her comments about *diaosi* and *hold zhu*, such as “*even the closest English words were very different from what I wanted to say*” and “*it was just this and nothing else*”, it could be said that she seems to corroborate my analysis of these two instances of her translanguaging as achieving the pragmatic function of ‘*making specific meaning*’ through ‘*filling in a lexical gap*’.

4.3.3. ‘Çok sert’

(Literal meaning: ‘very hard’; approximate meaning: ‘very successful’ /

Participants: Arvin - L1 Mauritian Creole, Leonidas - L1 Greek, Sener - L1 Turkish)

This extract is from the third meeting of the society, and at this point the students brainstorm various roles and positions as well as they explain why they believe that they will be suitable for them. Sener argues that he can be the ideal event organiser, as he comes from Turkey, a country which is famous for its

social events. As he explains, in Turkey, they even have a specific expression to refer to a very successful social event, *çok sert*. As he added in our post-session interview, *çok sert* recently started being used extensively in the Turkish TV hit series ‘Yalan dünya’ (‘Lying world’), and it was thus further popularised as a catchy expression in Turkey.

- 1 **Sener** guys listen to me (.)
- 2 i know myself and i know the events i was organising in university
- 3 they were all so good so successful
- 4 because i organised them (.) ok (.)
- 5 but mainly because in turkey these events are important for our life
- 6 and we know how to organise these events
- 7 (1.2)
- 8 **Arvin** ok↑
- 9 **Sener** and so much that in turkey we even have a special word
- 10 for an event which is good and successful
- 11 then it's (.) **çok sert**
- 12 it's only in turkey and i'm very turkish=
- 13 **Arvin** =çok [**çok sert**?]
- 14 **Leonidas** [what does] **çok sert** mean? (1.7)
- 15 **Sener** yeah because **çok sert** in english exactly means very hard
- 16 and it's used for an event when it's good and successful=
- 17 **Arvin** =nice↑
- 18 **Leonidas** oh because i know (.) **çok** güzel means very nice beautiful, e?
- 19 my grandparents can speak turkish so i remember that
- 20 and **sert** in greece it's a turkish word but we have it
- 21 we have we say if a cigarette is strong and heavy it's sertiko
- 22 interesting isn't it? so i believe you=
- 23 **Arvin** =yeah you have the experience and the phrase too
- 24 yeah turkish people can organise nice events
- 25 and you can too then hahaha (1.1)
- 26 yeah you have a **çok sert** personality and style

- 27 (2.3)
 28 **Sener** thanks guys thank you

Sener opens this conversation by emphasising how successfully he used to organise social events as an undergraduate student in Turkey before coming to London. The pause of 1.2 seconds (line 7) gives his interlocutors the opportunity to appraise this, and Arvin's *ok* in an enthusiastic rising intonation (line 8) can be taken as a positive appraisal. This motivates Sener to continue, and in particular he links the success of these events to the fact that organising successful social events is an indispensable characteristic of the Turkish people. As he says, *in turkey these events are important for our life* (line 5) and *we know how to organise these events* (line 6). Sener further supports this by mentioning that the Turkish language has even a specific expression which is used to denote very successful social events, *çok sert* (line 11). As clarifications are asked here too (lines 13 and 14), Sener explains that the literal meaning of *çok sert* is *very hard* (line 15), but this expression is actually *used for an event when it's good and successful* (line 16).

Arvin immediately latches with his *nice* (line 17), again in an enthusiastic rising intonation showing his enthusiasm and liking of this. Leonidas also seems to like Sener's expression, thanks to the linguistic 'itinerary' of the words *çok* and *sert* from Turkey to Greece in the past, whereby he realises that he can use his previous linguistic resources and almost be sure about the meaning of this expression. Due to the contact of the neighbouring Turkish and Greek people throughout history, and therein through the contact of their languages too, he

extrapolates the meaning of *çok* in the somewhat related expression which he recalls, *çok güzel*, which he knows that means *very beautiful* (line 18). He also mentions that he knows the meaning of *sertiko* (line 21), a word of the Turkish stem *sert* and the Greek suffix *-iko*, because it is used in Greek even nowadays to mean *heavy* and *hard*, as it does in Turkish too. At the end, Leonidas's tag question *interesting isn't it?* (line 22) could be taken as an approval of this language contact. As was the case in the previous extracts, specific meaning is made here too and in particular a lexical gap was filled in. This is achieved as Sener draws *çok sert* from Turkish and uses it in this conversation with his fellow interlocutors, in lack of a Standard English word with which he could describe what he intended, as it is shown.

4.3.4. 'Chamak chalo'

(Hindi: 'चमक चल' / Literal meaning: 'item girl'; approximate meaning:

'favourite girl', 'girlfriend' / Participants: Arvin - L1 Mauritian Creole, Eshal - L1 Urdu, Jose - L1 Spanish)

This extract is also taken from the second meeting of the committee, during which the allocation of positions was still an agenda item. The conversation was getting heated at times, because more than one student was interested in the same position, and also because it was the president who had the final word on the issue and his opinion was not always satisfying everyone. In this dyadic conversation, Arvin tries to persuade Eshal to accept the position which he proposed. What is interesting is that he draws *chamak chalo* not from his mother tongue but from her linguacultural background, knowing her enthusiasm

about soundtracks from Bollywood movies, and in particular about *Chamak chalo*, the main soundtrack of the successful 2011 Bollywood movie 'Ra One' ('Devil'). As they both informed me in our subsequent interviews, *chamak chalo* in India are girls who men of high social or financial position want around them. So, in the past they used to employ them as private dancers, and nowadays they give them a minor job in their house or company as an excuse to meet them more often.

- 1 **Arvin** and i think then (.) <Marat> should be the officer of LSE
- 2 (1.0)
- 3 **Eshal** but but what about me then? (.)
- 4 because i was among the first ones who joined this society
- 5 and also i'm on my second year and he's a first year student
- 6 and (.) after all why not me but him?
- 7 (2.2)
- 8 **Arvin** well (.) because either you or him is the same for the society
- 9 you're both very good (.)
- 10 but i'll be the president and i'll need a secretary or a pa
- 11 and i can't work so closely with him (1.2)
- 12 but with you hahaha=
- 13 **Eshal** =(angry) why you're laughing?
- 14 **Arvin** ehm nothing (.)
- 15 but with you
- 16 you can be my ha you know ha my my (1.5) hahaha **chamak chalo**=
- 17 **Eshal** =hahaha what next?
- 18 **Arvin** i mean=
- 19 **Eshal** =i know what you mean↑=
- 20 **Arvin** =(singing the way the soundtrack goes) wanna be my **chamak chalo**
oh oh oh=
- 21 **Eshal** =hahaha sto:::p↑
- 22 i like this song

- 23 but not your idea so much haha=
 24 **Arvin** =yeah it's a nice song and is a nice idea as well (.)
 25 come on (.) i know you'll like both of them in the end (.)
 26 my **chamak chalo**?
 27 **Eshal** haha whatever arvin whatever hahaha
 28 just give me whatever role in the society and stop singing so bad
 29 and we're ok hahahaha
 30 **Arvin** haha ok ok

In this extract, Arvin sets out to explain that who will become his secretary or personal assistant is important. This is so, because he is the president of the society, and he cannot work closely with Murat but he can work with Eshal, as he explains (lines 10-12). Not finishing his sentence with explaining why he can work closely with Eshal but instead continuing with a repetitive laughter (line 12) makes Eshal immediately latch and in an angry tone she enquires the reason why he is laughing (line 13). This rather seems to bring Arvin to a rather difficult position, as it is signalled by the fact that he starts his sentence with *ehm* expressing some hesitation, and then he tries to continue, but his *nothing* suggests that he hesitates again, and finally he pauses for a while (line 14). The reason of his hesitation is revealed soon after, as he resumes his next utterance in a regular delivery rate, explaining amidst some word repetitions and outbreaks of laughter that this way Eshal can be his *chamak chalo* (line 16).

Of all the extracts with the students' conversations so far, it is the use of *chamak chalo* here which seems to have the most immediate and positive outcome. Eshal was very sceptical if not negative about Arvin's decision to choose Marat and not her for being the officer in their college and instead to

give her the position of his secretary or personal assistant. However, her stance changes immediately after hearing from Arvin that this way she can be his *chamak chalo*. First, Eshal bursts out laughing (line 17). Arvin, perhaps because he still does not know whether Eshal continues being angry and why she is laughing, tries to explain what he means by *chamak chalo* (line 18). But Eshal's *i know what you mean* in a rising intonation which shows some kind of enthusiasm (line 19) seems to suggest that her mood is better now. This helps Arvin forget his previous hesitations, and in a good mood he starts singing the soundtrack '*Chamak chalo*' in the way that it is actually sung in the movie (line 20). Eshal laughs extensively again (line 21), and she also now openly admits that she likes this song (line 22). Arvin even takes the liberty to address her in a playful way using the vocative *my chamak chalo* (line 26). Eshal's again laughs for a while in a good mood (line 28), and she finally shows the change in her stance by even inviting him to give her whatever role in their society (line 28), thus sealing their agreement and closing their conversation too. Thus, in this extract too, the students make specific meaning and in particular they fill in a lexical gap.

4.4. Using some more precise lexis

As it is discussed above, the overarching pragmatic function '*making specific meaning*' is found to be further broken down to two sub-functions, 'filling in a lexical gap' and '*using some more precise lexis*'. The former is illustrated in the

previous section, and examples for that matter are provided. This section is about the latter sub-function. Their difference is slight but important. In the case of *'filling in a lexical gap'*, the students were found to use lexis from a variety of linguistic sources which they had available and thus to make specific meaning, something which they could not have achieved at all by using lexis only from Standard English. On the other hand, *'using some more precise lexis'* suggests that the meaning which was made could have been made or at least could have been almost made using lexis from Standard English. However, by drawing lexis from all across their available linguistic repertoire, the students made meaning which was more exact.

4.4.1. 'Kefi'

(Greek: 'Κέφι' / Approximate meaning: 'high spirits', 'good mood', 'joy' /

Participants: Arvin - L1 Mauritian Creole, Jose - L1 Spanish, Leonidas - L1 Greek, Sener - L1 Turkish)

The extract below is taken from the third meeting of the society. The students just acknowledged the difficulty of organising events which would be attractive enough for their members to be willing not only to attend them but also to pay for them. Leonidas, then, shares his view that in order for this to happen the members of their society should know that in these events they will have an exceptionally good time. To describe exactly what he means, he uses *kefi*, drawn for his Greek mother tongue.

- 1 **Leonidas** i mean, we can persuade them to pay in our events (.)
2 you know, everyone should be entertained and enjoyed, right?=
3 **Sener** =[right]
4 **Arvin** [yes]
5 **Leonidas** and not only everyone else
6 but even ourselves should be ok too, obviously=
7 **Jose** =obviously, yeah
8 **Leonidas** and in my mind the only way to achieve this
9 is when whatever we say or do or organise
10 is done in a way that can make everyone have (2.6)
11 eeer (2.4)
12 i'll tell which word we have in greece used exactly for this case (3.8)
13 which could be a key-word for everyone in our events (3.4)
14 **kefi** is the word (.)
15 in english it is eeer (2.2)
16 [takes out his smartphone and tries to look that word up*]
17 **Arvin** ok↑ (.)
18 but seriously it's fine you don't have to do that=
19 **Leonidas** =eeeh give me one second please because
20 because this greek word in english (.) it means (1.6)
21 found it (.)
22 it says it's like high spirits or good mood or joy in english [*](1.3)
23 yeah these english words aren't bad to describe the events
24 but they they go round and round in what is needed here
25 but seriously man
26 that greek word is exactly what is needed in these events
27 not round and round but accurate and exact=
28 **Jose** =[hahaha]
29 **Sener** [hahaha] ha
30 **Arvin** [i see:::] (2.0)
31 and is **kefi** a noun or a verb or something else
32 like you're saying i'm **kefying** (.) or i'm **kefiful** (.) or i **kefi** something?
33 like i'm having a good time (.) or i'm delightful (.) or i like something?
34 **Leonidas** hahahahaha no no no my fault i didn't explain everything (.)
35 it's like i do something with **kefi** (.) or i have **kefi** (.) or i am in **kefi**

- 36 **Jose** like i'm in love perhaps?
- 37 **Leonidas** hahaha yeah haha well
- 38 **kefi** (.) the most appropriate for our events
- 39 **Sener** it sounds good to me, i mean=
- 40 **Jose** =you mean it sounds good the word or the idea?
- 41 **Sener** both, i mean
- 42 this is exactly what we need for the events
- 43 and the word is (.) specific and definite=
- 44 **Jose** =and i can say **kefi** with **kefi** (.)
- 45 and also i want our society to organise events with **kefi** too=
- 46 **Leonidas** =hahaha thank you really very much, guys

In this extract, Leonidas discusses what he believes their society members need in order to pay for their events. However, he seems quite unsure about how to best verbalise his thought. Thus, he pauses for 2.6 seconds (line 10), he utters *eeer* which also shows some hesitation, he pauses again for 2.4 seconds (line 11), he explains to everyone that he will let them know about a word which is *used exactly for this case* in Greece, and then there is one more pause of 3.8 seconds (line 12), as if he wants to pre-empt his interlocutors for what he is going to say or to gain some more time. After that, he highlights the importance of this upcoming word by characterising it *a key-word for everyone in these events* in Greece (line 13), and finally he lets them know that this word is *kefi* (line 14). Knowing that *kefi* is a word unknown to his interlocutors, Leonidas continues with trying to explain its meaning. But his hesitation seems to continue here too while he tries to render it in English, hence his hesitant *eeer* and his pause of 2.2 seconds (line 15). As he still cannot see how *kefi* can be rendered in Standard English, he takes out his smartphone to look that word up (line 16), something which I noted down immediately in my notes while I was

attending this meeting. Finally, he informs his interlocutors that the website which he consulted renders *kefi* in English as *high spirits or good mood or joy* (line 22). However, he explains that, although *these English words aren't bad to describe the events* (line 23), *they go round and round in what is needed here* (line 24), whereas *that greek word is exactly what is needed in these events* (line 26), in so far as it is *not round and round but accurate and exact* (line 27).

Kefi immediately attracts the interest of the other interlocutors. First, Arvin seems to be interested in knowing more about it. Thus, Arvin enquires the grammatical category of *kefi*, and in particular he asks whether it is a *noun* or a *verb* (line 31), and then he accommodates to it and uses it himself very creatively asking whether one can say *i'm kefying or i'm kefiful or i kefi something* (line 32), in the same way that one says *i'm having a good time or i'm delightful or i like something* (line 33). Leonidas explains that its actual use is in sentences such as *i do something with kefi or i have kefi or i am in kefi* (line 35). Subsequently, *kefi* seems to be endorsed by the rest of the interlocutors. Sener mentions that *it sounds good* to him (line 39), he continues with saying that *this is exactly what we need for the events* (line 42), and after him Jose also latches to add that he *can say kefi with kefi* (line 44), as well as that he wants their society *to organise events with kefi* (line 45). Leonidas seems happy with the positive reception of the word which he drew from the mother tongue and he used in this conversation in English, and thanks his interlocutors profoundly with his *thank you really very much* (line 46). The above analysis reveals one more example of the function 'making specific meaning', and in

particular the sub-function '*using some more precise lexis*'. This is so, because Leonidas could have expressed what he had in mind even if he had used lexis from Standard English too, but this way he achieved to be much more precise for that matter.

4.4.2. 'One bell', 'flash'

(Meaning: 'give someone a missed call' / Participants: Ales - L1 Slovakian, Arvin - L1 Mauritian Creole, Halim - L1 Arabic)

In the extract below, taken from the very last moments of the first meeting of the society, the students express their interest in keeping in touch with one another, and thus they decide to exchange telephone numbers by giving one another a missed call. For that matter, Ales and Halim respectively use *one bell* and *flash*. It is interesting to note that *one bell* and *flash* are not drawn from these students' mother tongues, as it is the case in the previous extracts with Linlin, nor from the mother tongue of one of their interlocutors, as it is the case with Eshal, but from English dialects and varieties of which these students had some experience in the past. As Ales informed me in our post-event interview, he started using *one bell* after he had recently heard it in Birmingham, explaining that in Birmingham it is the expression *to one bell someone* and not *to give someone a missed call* that is used. Other than that, he added, it is the translation of *to give someone a missed call* which is used in his mother tongue, Slovakian. Very similarly, Halim explained to me that it is the translation of *to give someone a missed call* which is used in his mother tongue, Arabic.

However, he picked up the verb *flash* before coming to London to study, when he was living in Nigeria, and this the expression which is most commonly used there for that matter.

- 1 **Ales** then let's exchange telephone numbers
- 2 and (.) we can talk another day again (1.3)
- 3 so (1.0)
- 4 ok could anyone please **one bell** me?
- 5 (1.4)
- 6 **Halim** what?
- 7 **Ales** **one bell**
- 8 (.)
- 9 **Halim** what is that?
- 10 **Ales** i love using the word **one bell**
- 11 it's from birmingham
- 12 it means to (.) ah (.) miss call someone
- 13 yeah (.) to give someone a miss call
- 14 **Halim** **one bell**?=
- 15 **Ales** =yeah **one bell**
- 16 because it's just (.) it (.) rings once=
- 17 **Halim** =ah ok
- 18 **Arvin** never heard of it (.) but i like it (.)
- 19 **Halim** yeah (.)
- 20 ok and when you finish guys **flash** me (.)
- 21 oh because in nigeria we say **flash**=
- 22 **Ales** =because [it **flashes**]
- 23 **Halim** [it **flashes**] the screen on the phone and then it turns off
- 24 **Ales** hahaha
- 25 **Arvin** good
- 26 **Ales** yeah
- 27 **Arvin** nice

As in the cases of Linlin's *diaosi* and *hold zhu* and Arvin's *chamak chalo* in the previous extracts, it can be argued here too that Ales does not ask his fellow interlocutors to *one bell* him (line 4), because he does not know or he does not remember the equivalent English expression. This is suggested from the fact that there is not any previously signalled hesitation on his part, from the fact that Halim utters his clarification request with his interrogative *what?* (line 6) and Ales continues using his *one bell* (line 7), and from his explicit metalinguistic comment that he loves using this expression (line 10). Likewise, later on, he also uses the Standard English expressions *to miss call someone* (line 12) and *to give someone a miss call* (line 13). Also, when Halim accommodates to Ales and he repeats the expression *one bell* in a question form as a prompt for Ales to confirm or disconfirm it (line 14), Ales confirms it with his *yeah one bell* (line 15). In addition, this confirmation comes in a latching way from Ales, which signals even more the certainty of his choice. Ales also justifies the choice of his *one bell* by reminding his interlocutors what a mobile phone actually does during a missed call, *it just rings once* (line 16). Likewise, in our post-event interview he explicitly referred to the fact that he was aware of the Standard English expression. It should also be noted that the use of *one bell* is endorsed by Ales' interlocutors, as is the case in the previous extracts too. It elicits the positive reply *ah ok* by Halim (line 14), which also comes as a latching to Ales' last utterance and thus indicates an even greater enthusiasm. It also leads to Arvin's *i like it* (line 15). Finally, Halim's *yeah* may also signal his need to express his agreement once again, this time with Arvin (line 19).

It is perhaps because Ales' *one bell* is welcomed by his interlocutors that Halim continues the conversation with asking them to *flash* him (line 20).

Again, as in the previous case, it could be argued that it is impossible for Halim not to have been aware of the Standard English expression *to give someone a missed call* either. This is so, because a few turns ago *missed call* was the topic of the students' discussion. Also, Halim explicitly informs everyone that this is the expression which they use in Nigeria for that matter (line 21), as well as he explains that the rationale behind *flash* is that this is exactly what a mobile phone does during a missed call, *it flashes the screen and then it turns off* (line 22). Likewise, in our post-event interview, Halim mentioned that he studies Electronic Engineering and Communication with specialisation in mobile phones technology, thus he surely knew that Standard British expression. It is also important to note that Halim's *flash* is also received favourably. Before he finishes his explanation, Ales' *because it flashes* (line 21) is both a latching and a sentence completion to Halim's last sentence, and it could be said that it thus indicates his agreement that *flash* is a successful choice because a mobile phone actually flashes during a missed call. Likewise, Arvin's *good* (line 25) and *nice* (line 27) also seem to come as a positive appraisal of Halim's *flash*.

What is argued here is that Ales and Halim used *one bell* and *flash*, because they aim at '*making specific meaning*' and in particular at '*using some more precise lexis*'. It is interesting to add that it is the comments of Ales and Halim during our post-event interview which helped me sharpen my understanding of the pragmatic-functional significance of the lexis which they used, by means of

not seeing it as an instance of the function *'filling in a lexical gap'* but as *'using some more precise lexis'*.

Hehe, of course, our generation had mobile phones since we were born, so of course I knew this, this expression, in English, 'give someone a missed call'... And, yeah, if I use, if I had used this one, I would say what I wanted to say, of course. But... I told them, the other guys, back then, I love using the other one, 'one bell'... It's more, more, like, much more to the point.

(Ales)

Well, if you're at UCL and you study triple E (note: he referred to the undergraduate course 'Electronic and Electrical Engineering') and you don't know the expression 'give someone a missed call', don't know, something must be wrong with you... So, yes, I can assure you that I knew this expression... And, yeah, come on, I can agree that a lot of people use it and they communicate... Still, what? 'Flash' is so much more appropriate in this situation, because it's so much more characteristic of that function of mobile phones during that particular moment.

(Halim)

In both these interview extracts, the students explicitly refer to the fact that they are aware of the English expression 'to give someone a missed call'. Thus, the possibility of not using it because of some kind of linguistic deficiency has to be excluded. Then, they admitted that with this expression they could have expressed their thoughts. However, and this is the important issue here, they both believed that the expressions which they used are "much more to the

point”, according to Ales, and “so much more appropriate”, according to Halim. This helped me understand that, with these two expressions, Ales and Halim did not achieve to *‘fill in a lexical gap’*, as there was not any *‘gap’*, since an expression already existed. Instead, it was most appropriate to talk here about *‘using some more precise lexis’*.

4.5. Discussion

The first research question of this thesis has to do with the discerning of the wordings and features of discourse which emerge in ELF conversations. Thus, the aim of this section is to bring together some of the most salient wordings- and discourse-related findings which were yielded from the analysis of the instances of translanguaging in the previous section. One of the first points which could be made here regards the fact that it is important to expand the investigative scope regarding the elements which cannot be utilised in such conversations, as it is mentioned above that it is the focus of some studies on code-switching (e.g. MacSwan 2000, Myers-Scotton’s 1993, Poplack 1983), and look at what can be utilised. The linguistic items drawn and discussed here are not restricted to any particular grammatical category, but belong to a variety of grammatical categories, such as nouns, adjective phrases, verb phrases. For instance, Leonidas’ *kefi* is a noun (extract 4.4.1), Seren’s *çok sert* (extract 4.3.3) and Eshal’s *chamak chalo* (extract 4.3.4) are adjective phrases, Halim’s *flash* is a verb (extract 4.4.2), and Ales’ *one bell* is a verb phrase (extract 4.4.2). Also,

Linlin's *diaosi* (extract 4.3.1) and *hold zhu* (extract 4.3.2) are catchy expressions among youngsters, while Leonidas' *kefi* (extract 4.4.1) is an everyday word.

Likewise, there was a wide range of options with regard to the fact that it was not any particular language or language variety or dialect from which the students were drawing linguistic items, but various ones, for instance, Mandarin Chinese in the case of Linlin's *diaosi* (extract 4.3.1) and *hold zhu* (extract 4.3.2), and Turkish in the case of Seren's *çok sert* (extract 4.3.3). In addition, as it was shown, students were drawing lexical items from their mother tongues, as was the case of Seren's *çok sert* (extract 4.3.3) and Leonidas' *kefi* (extract 4.4.1). They were also drawing lexical items from the languages of their interlocutors, even if these were among the few ones which they knew from these languages, as it was the case with Arvin's *chamak chalo* from Eshal's background (extract 4.3.4). Finally, the students were drawing lexis from other English dialects and varieties, as it was the case with Ales' *one bell* which he picked up when he visited Birmingham and Halim's *flash* which is used in Nigeria (extract 4.4.2).

In addition, it is important to highlight the importance of the context in which translanguaging was found to occur. In every extract, before every instance of the students' translanguaging, there were plenty of comments from their interlocutors with which they were showing their agreement with one another. To illustrate this with some examples, there could be mentioned Eshal's *yeah you're right* (line 5, extract 4.3.1), Arvin's *yeah* (line 10, extract 4.3.1) and Marat's *true* (line 5, extract 4.3.1) towards Linlin, when she took the floor and

started discussing the characteristics of the society's officers in each college. There were also latches, sentence completions, overlappings, back channellings, and cases of rising intonation and interjections, signalling the students' enthusiasm about what had just been said, as well as signalling their keen interest and involvement in their conversation. For instance, such was the latching of Eshal (line 5, extract 4.3.1), and the overlapping speech of Arvin and Marat (lines 10-11, extract 4.3.1). It could be argued that such a co-operative and collaborative environment was helpful in allowing the students not to feel any worry or any other preoccupation that they would be negatively appraised by their fellow interlocutors, and instead to feel free to draw linguistic elements from various sources which they had available. This echoes the findings in other ELF studies which were discussed above (e.g. Cogo and Dewey 2006, 2012; Dewey 2007, 2011), in which the linguistic innovations in the investigated conversations also emerged in a context where participants showed their support and agreement with one another.

Also, it could be argued that this co-operative and collaborative context and also the positive attitude which the students were showing towards one another in the extracts analysed above, constituted some kind of initial contributing factor which was helping the students draw linguistic items from all the sources which they had available in the first place, as discussed above. Further to this, and acknowledging the importance of the previously mentioned sequential analysis (Li 1998), it would not be exaggerating to argue that all this supportive context and the welcoming appraisal were also subsequently giving some kind of

courage to the students to draw lexis again from their available linguistic sources. It could be added that this was taking place in two ways. First, a student would translanguange, this would be appraised positively, and subsequently the same student would do the same. Such was the case of Linlin's *diaoshi* (extract 4.3.1) and *hold zhu* (extract 4.3.2). Second, a student would draw lexis this way, this would be appraised positively and would pave the way for the other students to do the same. Such were the examples of Ales' *one bell* and Halim's *flash* (extract 4.4.2).

In the same vein, it is also important to note that the students were showing a keen interest in all the linguistic items which their interlocutors were drawing from the linguistic sources which they had available. Every time that the students were using some lexis which was not readily understood by their interlocutors, their interlocutors were immediately starting engaging with it asking about its meaning and its use. Perhaps the most characteristic example of this kind was when Arvin tried to find out more about Leonidas' *kefi*, and he enquired whether one can say *i'm kefying* or *i'm kefiful* or *i kefi something* (line 32, extract 4.4.1). What is more, at times, the students were also accommodating to this new lexis and they were also using it. For instance, Jose accommodated to Leonidas' *kefi* and he mentioned *i can say kefi with kefi* (line 44, extract 4.4.1), and then he added *i want our society to organise events with kefi* too (line 45, extract 4.4.1). In that sense, the students were not at all found to exhibit the 'let-it-pass' principle (Firth 1996). According to the 'let-it-pass' principle, as it is discussed above, when non-native interlocutors cannot

understand something which was said, they let the conversation continue because they hope that they will figure it out later on, or because they do not care about it as much as to ask about it, or because they are too shy to show that they did not understand what was said (ibid.). On the contrary, in the extracts which were looked at here, the students were immediately engaging with the new lexis asking about their meaning and their use, as it was shown.

Further to all the above, it is also important to highlight the students' translanguaging and the pragmatic functions which they were thus achieving. Traditionally, as it is argued in some of the studies mentioned above (e.g. McClure 1981, Zentella 1997), the alteration of linguistic items in the course of a single conversation is seen as motivated by some kind of linguistic deficiency, whereby the speakers do not know or can not remember a particular word, and thus they have to resort to their mother tongue in order to compensate for this lack of knowledge. However, the findings yielded from the analysis of the conversations in this chapter suggest that the students were not motivated by any sort of linguistic deficiency. Instead, it was found here that every time the students were aware of the equivalent Standard English word or phrase or expression, as well as they were conscious regarding their strategic decision to make these linguistic choices. In particular, in doing so, they were found that they were achieving the overall pragmatic function of *'making specific meaning'* through translanguaging in ELF conversations, and the sub-functions *'filling in a lexical gap'* and *'using some more precise lexis'*. This functions with its two sub-functions add to the list of functions which have been discerned so far in studies

on ELF interactions (e.g. Hülmbauer 2007, Kordon 2006, Pitzl, Breiteneder and Klimpfinger 2008, Pölzl 2003), as discussed in the introductory part of this chapter.

Last but not least, the function and the sub-functions discerned here expand our understanding of translanguaging as a whole. As it is shown, drawing of lexis from all the linguistic sources which the speakers have available, no matter whether these are their mother tongue, or another language which they learnt later in their life, or a language dialect and variety which they experienced for a little while, or whether this is theirs or their interlocutors', is a legitimate and valid practice in the way that they set out to achieve their communicative objectives. This tallies with the findings of various other studies discussed earlier, for instance the ones within the paradigm of translanguaging (e.g. Creese and Blackledge 2010; Garcia and Li 2014; Li and Zhu 2010; Lin 2006, 2012). In addition, they go some way towards answering the call for expanding the scope of the communicative competence (see e.g. Leung 2005, 2013) with reference to the fact that in contemporary conditions there is extensive communication between speakers from differing linguacultural backgrounds. The language implications and pedagogic applications of the above, in line with the requirements of the second research question of this research study, will be discussed in Chapter 8. For the time being, what follows in the next analytical chapter.

4.6. Summary

This chapter looks at the natural occurring spoken discourse of the meetings of the international students of this research study with the aim to shed some light at translanguaging practices. In particular, it aims at discerning the pragmatic functions which were achieved when students were using language this way, that is, when they were drawing linguistic items from all the linguistic sources which they had available. To this end, six extracts were looked at. In their co-operative and collaborative context, students were found to be drawing a wide range of lexis not only from their mother tongues but also from other language dialects and varieties of which they had some knowledge, and the linguistic items drawn belonged to various grammatical categories and to various spheres of their social and cultural life. As it is shown, this practice was not motivated by any linguistic deficiency, but instead in doing so the students were achieving various pragmatic functions. The overall pragmatic function which was thus found to be achieved in these extracts was '*making specific meaning*', and it was further broken down into two sub-functions, '*filling in a lexical gap*' and '*using some more precise lexis*'.

CHAPTER 5.

ACHIEVING POLITENESS THROUGH TRANSLANGUAGING

5.1. Introduction

This chapter is conceptually related to the previous one, but their foci are different. The previous chapter discusses instances of translanguaging and their pragmatic significance. In particular, it discusses how the students of this research study were drawing lexical items from all across their linguistic repertoire which they had available and how they were thus making specific meaning. This chapter also sets out to look at translanguaging instances whereby the students were drawing lexis from all across their linguistic background. However, it does so from the perspective of how they were thus achieving politeness in their discussions. In this chapter, first, there is a review of some of the major politeness theories in sociolinguistics, as well as a review of how politeness has been investigated in ELF conversations between speakers from differing sociocultural backgrounds. Building on these considerations, what follows is an analysis of politeness in four extracts from the audio-recordings of the students' meetings. As it is shown, the overall pragmatic function which was found is '*achieving politeness*', and it is broken down into two sub-functions, '*displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English*' and '*increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background*'.

5.2. Outlining the relevant concepts and notions

One of the key factors which may contribute to the commencement or the continuation of social activities is politeness. In turn, one of the key considerations of those who participate in such activities is how they can achieve politeness. However, achieving politeness is not a straightforward process, all the more so in contemporary social activities in which people may come from differing linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds. Although there is no single definition of politeness, this phenomenon can be commonsensically understood as having good manners or etiquette in social interactions and situations. In recent years, politeness also drew a lot of attention in sociolinguistics. One of the first sociolinguists to study politeness as an important aspect of interaction was Lakoff (e.g. 1973, 1977). Influenced by Gricean pragmatics and in particular by Grice's Co-operative Principle (1957), Lakoff saw politeness as expressed through two universally applied sets of syntactic rules within the wider framework of pragmatics. The first set of rules is *Be clear*, and is based on Grice's Cooperative Principle Maxims. The first one of these Maxims is the *Maxim of Quantity*, which is associated with the speakers' need to provide as much information as needed in the conversation and not more or less. The second is the *Maxim of Quality*, which is associated with the speakers' need to state what is believed to be true according to their evidence and knowledge. The third one is the *Maxim of Relations*, which emphasises their need to be relevant to the topic of the conversation, and the fourth one is the *Maxim of Manner*, which emphasises their need to be concise and precise

and to avoid confusing and ambiguous statements. The second set of rules is *Be polite*, and includes *Don't impose*, *Give options* and *Make others feel good*. When the balance of these three maxims is thrown off, speakers consider their interlocutors to be impolite. Lakoff also notes that interlocutors should seek to find the balance between these rules and maxims, in so far as not all of them can be attended to at the same time (ibid.) (see also Chapter 7 for more on Lakoff's work from a rapport perspective, which is the focus there).

Expanding on Lakoff's rules of politeness, and drawing on Goffman's (e.g. 1955, 1959) early idea of face, Brown and Levinson (1987) developed their own theory of politeness. Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness revolves around two kinds of face, *negative face* and *positive face*, which reflect two different desires which are present in every interaction. In particular, *negative face* reflects speakers' desire to express their ideas without resistance. On the other hand, *positive face* reflects speakers' desire to have their contributions in their interactions approved. Brown and Levinson also argue that face is perishable, and as such it should be continually monitored and ensured during the entirety of a conversation. Thus, it is important for interlocutors not only to continue saving their own face, but also to continue saving the face of others in case of face-threatening acts. Brown and Levinson also propose possible strategies which interlocutors can use in order to deal with face threatening acts. For instance, the *bald on-record politeness* is associated with the strategy used in situations where people know each other well, or in situations of urgencies, such as when a speaker may shout "*watch out*" to some interlocutors to protect

them from something even if this interrupts what they were saying at that point. On the other hand, the *off-record* strategy is more indirect, and it requires the hearer to interpret what the speaker is trying to say. Also, with the *positive politeness* strategy, speakers aim at minimising the threat to their interlocutors, such as by adding some kind of humour in their conversation or hedging their arguments. Last but not least, speakers can use the *negative politeness* strategy when they require something from their interlocutor or when they ask them questions, while at the same time maintaining the interlocutors' right to refuse. The strategies outlined above are important to keep in mind here, as the aim of this chapter is also to look at how the students were achieving politeness in their ELF-mediated meetings.

Taking a more pragmatic and social perspective, Leech's (1983) theory on politeness begins with drawing on two systems or fields, pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. As he explains, the field of pragmalinguistics has to do with the speakers' illocutionary acts, that is, their intentions, and it also accounts for the biggest number of linguistic applications and manifestations of politeness in his theory. These two aspects underline this chapter too, as this chapter also focuses on the speakers' intentions regarding achieving politeness. On the other hand, sociopragmatics is associated with how speakers would like to be perceived by their interlocutors. Leech also introduces two conversational notions which he calls *rhetorics*, the *textual rhetoric* and the *interpersonal rhetoric*. The *textual rhetoric* refers to the organisation of a text in a way which contributes to the language users' objectives. On the other hand, the

interpersonal rhetoric addresses various interpersonal aspects of a text. Leech considers these aspects *principles*, and he identifies three. The *politeness principle* has to do with the relationship between the speakers and their interlocutors. It accounts for the regulation of familiarity between them, as well as for the feeling that contributions to their conversations are useful and thus accepted by their interlocutors. The *irony principle* deals with the way that the speakers can be perceived by their interlocutors as being polite, no matter what their true intentions are. The third *principle* is associated with *Grice's conversational principle*, and it is divided into seven maxims in an attempt for the speakers to minimise or maximise various elements in their interactions, such as praising themselves or their interlocutors. Leech's theory of politeness also introduces five scales, which are used to determine how the maxims should be used. The *cost benefit scale* weighs the costs and the benefits which an act will have on the speakers and their audience. The *optionality scale* weighs how much choice the speakers' objectives will allow the audience. The *indirectness scale* weighs how hard the audience have to work to understand the speakers. The *authority scale* weighs whether the speakers have the right to impose their ideas to the audience. Finally, the *social distance scale* weighs the degree of familiarity between the speakers and the audience. The aspect of sociopragmatics which has to do with how the speakers would like to be perceived by their interlocutors also underpins the analysis of the extracts here, in so far as the students were found to have a strong interest in being considered polite by their fellow interlocutors, as it is shown below.

All the theories above highlight politeness as an important phenomenon in social life, but they receive a lot of criticism too. For instance, Eelen (2001) observes that Lakoff's theory approaches politeness from a Gricean speech act perspective, and thus priority is given to the speakers' intentions, i.e. the illocution, without accounting sufficiently for the effect which they may have on their interlocutors, i.e. the perlocution. Likewise, due to the Gricean speech act perspective, interactions which did not involve a pre-determined goal are ignored, such as simply taking part in a casual conversation (*ibid.*, and also cf. the notion of convivial communication in Leung 2005). Similarly, in Brown and Levinson's face-based politeness theory, the strategies which they proposed cover a limited type of interactions between interlocutors, since the examples which they provide consist mainly of single utterances which they presuppose to have a specific communicative objective in a specific situation or context, such as advising your interlocutors or granting them permission to use something which is yours. Also, their theory seems to suggest that people follow a rather pre-arranged set of universal rules when they interact with others, and this is what prevents their interaction from breaking down, or at least minimises the conflicts in their interaction. This means that there is the tacit assumption that different cultures are homogenous, and thus there is an agreement of what politeness is as well as how it is achieved or sustained. Therefore, there is no sufficient account of how politeness is achieved or sustained in more complex situations, all the more so when the interactants come from different sociocultural backgrounds (see e.g. Blum-Kulka and House 1989, Ervin-Tripp 1976; and also cf. Scollon and Scollon 2001). Finally, Locher (2004) notes that

Leech's theory is too vague, in so far as a new maxim can be introduced to account for any language use, and thus the number of maxims seems arbitrary and infinite. Also, Leech's theory seems to equate politeness with indirectness, although there are cases in which a direct utterance can be the appropriate form of politeness too (*ibid.*).

More recent accounts of politeness set out to take into consideration criticisms such as the above. For instance, because it is clear that politeness cannot be ensured only according to the intention of the speakers or by their usage of particular linguistic devices, and its ratification by their interlocutors should also somehow be observed, Watts (2003) looks at the role of the speakers in conversations but he complements that with the role of the interlocutors. In addition, the differences between cultures are also taken into consideration. For instance, Gu (1990) discusses politeness from the perspective of the Chinese societal and moral norms, Ide's (1989) discussion is based on the Japanese honorific forms, and Ogierman (2008, 2009) provides a comparison between the politeness practices in Poland and other countries. In other words, these accounts of politeness aim at being more socially sensitive and sensible regarding the contested nature of politeness as manifested by the heterogeneity of assessments and judgments among interactants when they come from differing sociocultural backgrounds. These are also complemented by accounts on politeness regarding interactants who belong to the same cultural background but they differ in terms of other characteristics (see e.g. Mills 2003 for a politeness-related account on interactants with different gender, and

Usami 1993 on interactants who are unacquainted). Politeness has also been approached from the perspective of what happens with regard to the language in which multilingual speakers swear (Dewaele 2004).

Although it is outside the scope of this chapter to go into any detail with regard to these criticisms per se, some of their shared ground can be discussed here, not least because this chapter shares the same concerns. For instance, as it is shown in the analysis of the extracts of this chapter below, the identified politeness-related pragmatic functions are not pre-arranged by the speakers, but constructed online while they are conversing with their interlocutors. That is, in order for me to identify these functions, it was not enough to look only at the linguistic exponents of the speakers, but also to consider how their interlocutors were appraising them, that is, whether they were accepting them and thus ratifying them. Likewise, in order to identify the politeness-related pragmatic functions, it was not enough to look only within the text, but also to take into consideration other pieces of information provided by the students, such as their metalinguistic comments during our post-event interviews. Last but not least, any tacit assumption about the cultural homogeneity and universality of politeness is not shared by the conceptual and analytical sensitivities and sensibilities of an ELF-informed research study such as this one, as one of its underpinning tenets is the de facto sociocultural diversity of the speakers who use English as their common and shared language of communication and what they bring along in their interactions with other interlocutors.

The above constitute some of the primary considerations which inform the politeness-related discussion in ELF research studies too. However, one of the fundamental analytical dimensions which ELF research introduced was the heightened variability in terms of speakers' language usage and use. In other words, in addition to the diversity in terms of the speakers' cultural backgrounds, ELF research works with the assumption that speakers bring along to their conversations a great variety of linguistic elements too. An interesting shared characteristic of this body of research which is worth reiterating here is that it does not view the overall ELF context as problematic, because of the interaction of people who by default come from differing linguacultural backgrounds. That is, it does not see these diverse backgrounds as any inherent reason of politeness mitigation, because of which the speakers have to take some remedial action in order to resolve the issue. This would be closer to the linguacultural deficiency perspective which is discussed in earlier chapters. Instead, ELF studies seek to investigate how politeness is achieved and sustained in ELF-mediated conversations.

With this take on politeness, Pölzl (2009) looks at Turkish academics conversing with international students, and she reports that one of the ways that they set out to sound polite is by using Turkish politeness conventions, such as particular honorifics showing endearment and affection, such as "*effendi*" and "*effendim*", which respectively mean "*lord*" and "*my lord*". Elsewhere, Metsä-Ketelä (2006), using the ELFA corpus, finds that discourse hedging and in particular the expression "*more or less*" is used extensively by non-native

speakers in order to sound more polite towards their interlocutors. Likewise, Riekkinen (2010) looks at doctoral oral defences and finds that ELF speakers use more lexical hedges in the ELFIA corpus than the speakers in the ENL MICASE corpus, in order to communicate their intention to be perceived as polite by their interlocutors. In the same vein, Pullin Stark (2009, 2010) looks at business meetings, and reports that the *small talk between the companies' members of staff play a key role regarding the politeness needed in such situations, and in turn in the building of trust between them. The findings of the strategies used to achieve politeness in the ELF interactions in the studies discussed above are important to keep in mind here, as the aim of this chapter is to shed some more light on how politeness is achieved in ELF conversations.*

The examples looked at here again come from audio-recordings from the meetings of the society of the international students who participated in this research study. As the students came from various countries around the world, they were bringing along in their meetings various elements from their respective sociocultural backgrounds. Likewise, they were speakers not only of English but also of their respective mother tongues, and some of them of other languages as well as language dialects and varieties, with some also having some knowledge of the languages of their interlocutors. All these were utilised extensively, in so far as it is found here that the linguistic items employed in the students' effort to achieve politeness are drawn from the entire gamut of their linguistic resources through translanguaging, as it is mentioned in the introductory section of this chapter. Again, here too, the examples are grouped

around two pragmatic sub-functions. The first one is '*displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English*', and the second is '*increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background*'.

Again, each time, I specify the source of the information and the meaning of the words and phrases or expressions which are looked at. Usually, this source were the students themselves in our post-event interviews, or other friends or colleagues of mine who were speaking these languages, or various online dictionaries in case I was looking them up myself. Some metalinguistic comments from the students themselves are also provided here.

5.3. Displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English

As mentioned above, '*displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English*' is the first sub-function which was identified when politeness was achieved in the students' meetings. To illustrate this sub-function, three extracts are analysed below. However, a caveat is needed here. As discussed in Chapter 3, the body of data was allowed to speak for itself. Thus, regarding the first research question relating to discourse features which can be discerned in ELF interactions, this subsection on the avoidance of profanity came about after considering the students' interactions in light of a telling comment from one of the international students, Winnie from Hong Kong, who commented on why avoiding profanity was so crucial for her. After the meeting, she came to see me and referred specifically to the interaction described below. She expressed her

belief that all fellow members in their student society are good. Still, she added that she noticed that because of their young age or for other reasons, especially outside the meetings, they sometimes use words which she would not use, and she had started having second thoughts regarding her continuation in the meetings. However, as she concluded, when she saw the effort to avoid profanity in this meeting, this made her rebuilt her interest in their student society. In addition, it could be argued that the students' effort to set out to avoid profanity shows that, even in situations where there are interactants from differing sociocultural backgrounds, there is still an awareness of politeness.

5.3.1. 'I have seeds'

(Mandarin Chinese hanzi: '有种'; pinyin: 'you zhong' / Approximate meaning: 'I have balls', 'I have courage' / Participants: Arvin - L1 Mauritian Creole, Jose - L1 Spanish, Linlin - L1 Mandarin Chinese)

The discussion below takes part almost immediately after the one with Linlin's *diaosi* and *hold zhu* discussed in the previous chapter. Here, Linlin, again after sketching out the characteristics of the ideal officer of the society at her college, elaborates on why she believes that she could make a good candidate for that position. At some point, she uses the idiomatic expression *i have seeds* in English, which is the translation of the Mandarin Chinese *you zhong*, as she explained to me in our post-event interview.

- 1 **Linlin** so (.) yeah it depends
 2 i mean (.)
 3 when i must i can listen to others and do what they want
 4 to keep them happy (.)
 5 but also when i want i can be strong
 6 and say no you'll do this you'll do that
 7 (1.8)
 8 **Marat** hmm good tell us more (.)
 9 **Linlin** and i'm not afraid to do what i have to do (.)
 10 so yeah even if others disagree if something must be done
 11 **i have i have seeds** you know haha
 12 to do what i have to do=
 13 **Marat** =what? you **[have]**
 14 **Linlin** **[have] seeds** yeah
 15 **Marat** you mean you **have the seeds**
 16 you mean for the future? (1.2)
 17 because in english we they we say
 18 in english it is **i have the seeds**
 19 ahh i i have a quality but it's too early or i'm young
 20 so it will be obvious it will show in the futu[re]
 21 **Linlin** [no]
 22 no no **i have seeds** (.)
 23 ahh it's chinese (.) you zhong
 24 **Marat** oh
 25 **Linlin** it's about what i told you before about my character
 26 but in english i know it but i don't want to say it (1.2)
 27 it has a bad word it's not a good word (1.3)
 28 it starts from letter b [hahaha you know]
 29 **Jose** [haha ok i see:::]
 30 you can say have guts [then]
 31 **Linlin** [yeah] i forgot about that
 32 i just remembered the other one with the b
 33 but i didn't want to say it because there is a bad word there
 34 so i used the chinese one **i have seeds** haha=
 35 **Marat** =haha great (.) **you had the seeds** to do this ha[ha]

In this extract, Linlin sets out to emphasise the fact that she has the courage to insist when certain things have to be done, and for that matter she draws the idiomatic expression *i have seeds* from Mandarin Chinese (line 11). This expression immediately catches the attention of her interlocutors. For instance, Marat latches and his interrogative *what* signals his explanation request regarding the meaning of this expression which is unknown to him (line 13). He even attempts to provide an explanation based on the meaning of the word *seeds* which he knows from Standard English. Interestingly enough, in doing so, he oscillates between *we* and *they* and *we* say again (line 17), thus signalling some kind of awareness of the fact that nowadays the English language is not used only by native speakers, hence *they*, but it is a code of communication which everybody shares and which is somehow associated to everybody who speaks it, hence *we*. In Standard English, *seeds* refers to something which is starting now and has the potential to become more important in due course. Thus, Marat tries to see whether Linlin's expression means something along the lines of *i have a quality but it's too early or i'm young so it will be obvious and it will show in the future* (lines 20-21). However, Linlin's overlapping *no* (line 21) and her repetitive *no* (line 22) make it clear that this expression is not related to the meaning of *seeds* in Standard English. As she explains (lines 22-25), the expression *i have seeds is chinese*, and she used it to refer to her character regarding her courage to continue her tasks no matter the difficulties.

What follows is also important, because it sheds light on the reason behind Linlin's choice to use this Mandarin Chinese idiomatic expression, as well as it shows the interlocutors' appraisal of it. As it is mentioned above, for the purposes of this study, meaning is not seen as being made only upon speakers uttering a phrase or an expression, but their interlocutors' appraisal of it is crucial for that matter too. In this case, as Linlin explains (lines 26-28), she is aware of the Standard English idiomatic expression *i have balls* which she could have used, but she did not want to use it because this expression *has a bad word*, which she repeats by saying that *[this word is] not a good word*. Her argument seems to get even more weight after a while, when she repeats the rationale behind her linguistic choice. When Jose offers his opinion that she could have used the expression *have guts* (line 30), she repeats the fact that she remembered *the other one with the b* (i.e. *balls*) (line 32), but she did not want to use it because it contains *a bad word* (line 33) and that is why she *used the chinese one i have seeds* (line 34).

It is also be important to note that the attitude of Linlin's interlocutors towards her expression seems to be positive, as it is this way that her expression can be considered legitimate. For that matter, Marat (line 35) immediately latches and starts his sentence with laughter, followed by *great*, which shows his approval of Linlin's utterance. In addition, he continues and he even accommodates to Linlin as he uses her expression himself in a creative and approving way to tell her that she *had the seeds to do this*, meaning that she was courageous enough not to conform to the Standard English equivalent idiomatic expression but to

decide to use a new idiomatic expression in such a creative way. This final comment also ends with an appreciative overlapping laughter from Marat and Jose (line 35) and also with a *yeah* from Jose also signalling his positive attitude towards Linlin's expression (line 36). Therefore, it could be argued that this extract shows that Linlin's explanation testifies to the fact that she did not avoid the Standard English expression because she did not know or could not recall it. In other words, she was motivated not by linguistic deficiency, but from her objective to be polite towards her interlocutors by means of '*displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English*'.

5.3.2. 'Blin'

(Russian: 'блин' / Literal meaning: 'pancake'; additional meaning: 'prostitute' / Participants: Arvin - Mauritian Creole, Eshal - L1 Urdu, Jose - L1 Spanish, Marat - L1 Russian)

At some point during the second meeting, the students wonder about their potential funding opportunities. They rule out the fact that they can count on registration fees or donations from their members, because all their members are students and students' financial situation is not always good. It is at this point that Arvin mentions that the university itself may provide them with some funding. From a quick and wrong calculation, Arvin argues that they can receive even up to ten thousand pounds per year, and this amount is so big that Marat is surprised. He sounds as if he wants to express his surprise by exclaiming *bloody hell* in English, but he stops, and he ends up exclaiming *blin*, which he

draws from his mother tongue Russian. As he mentioned in our post-session interview, *blin* literally means *pancake* in Russian, but in youth slang it has become a swear word because it sounds very similar to *blyad* which means *prostitute*.

- 1 **Eshal** what about then what about funding from the university
- 2 i mean come on the university must have money to give us=
- 3 **Jose** =yeah that's a good proposal e::r suggestion=
- 4 **Eshal** =yeah proposal and suggestion because=
- 5 **Arvin** =because because a friend was studying here some years ago
- 6 and he told me their college was giving them eeer
- 7 five hundred pounds per year (.)
- 8 so because we will be a society for all the colleges of the university
- 9 and the university has twenty colleges
- 10 we may receive like
- 11 i mean like twenty multiplied with five hundred makes
- 12 makes ten thousand pounds per year? =
- 13 **Marat** =[bloody he- bloody bl- bl- **blin**↑]
- 14 **Jose** [wo:::w that's like a dream↑]
- 15 **Eshal** [but this not possible this is too much]=
- 16 **Arvin** =oh oh oh guys
- 17 please you shouldn't speak talk all together
- 18 'cause nobody can hear nobody this way (.)
- 19 <Marat> i noticed you swore bloody hell or bloody in your accent?
- 20 or wait (.) you said **blin**?
- 21 you wanted to correct my maths?
- 22 because **blin** is that newly founded number between six and seven? =
- 23 **Marat** =[hahaha]hahahahahaha
- 24 **Jose** [hahaha]
- 25 **Eshal** [hahaha]
- 26 **Marat** what?
- 27 don't know what you're saying
- 28 **Arvin** no seriously

- 29 **blin** our tutor told us someone found a new number
 30 a number between six and seven and he called it **blin**=
 31 **Marat** =[hahaha dunno] what you're you talking about man
 32 **Jose** [hahahahahaha]
 33 **Eshal** [hahahahahaha]
 34 **Arvin** then then what did you say?=
 35 =hahaha yeah ok i said **blin** (.)
 36 but in russian **blin** means pancake but it's like swearing↑
 37 but yeah actually means pancake don't know what it's swearing (.)
 38 i think because it's like it sounds like blyad which means prostitute=
 39 **Eshal** =[hahaha]
 40 **Jose** [hahaha]haha prostitute
 41 **Arvin** ah ok i see↑
 42 **Marat** in russia i avoid swearing usually
 43 but here sometimes i want to swear
 44 but actually i don't want to swear at all
 45 so instead of in english i swear in russian (.)
 46 like i do it but i keep it for myself and others can't understand it
 47 like you now
 48 unless they ask me what did i say and i have to say to them
 49 like you now too
 50 (.)
 51 **Arvin** strange situation with your explanation of your word **blin**
 52 **Marat** yeah as strange as your number between six and seven **blin**=
 53 **Jose** =[hahaha]
 54 **Eshal** [hahaha]ha
 55 **Jose** but i agree i believe you it happens
 56 **Arvin** yes

From the early start of this extract, there are a lot of signals of collaboration and co-operation between the participants. For instance, when Eshal talks about funding from their university (lines 1-2), Jose immediately shows his interest by latching, and by starting his utterance with *yeah* thus showing even more his

agreement with her (line 3). Eshal also shows her interest in the conversation by latching and starting her utterance with *yeah* as well, and she continues with stressing the *and* between Jose's *proposal* and *suggestion* showing that she believes that both of them are good ideas (line 4). Subsequently, when Eshal sets out to justify why she believes that and starts her justification with *because* (line 4), there is a sentence completion with Arvin latching and starting his sentence with *because* too (lines 5-12). It could be argued that this supportive context also contributes to the drawn word discussed here. This takes place when Marat hears Arvin calculating how much funding they can receive and arguing that their society may be eligible for even ten thousand pounds per year (line 12). This amount of funding is so big that Marat immediately latches, and he wants to exclaim and swear as a way to show his surprise (line 13). He starts his exclamation with *bloody he*, arguably from *bloody hell* in English, but he stops, he continues with only *bloody* this time, then he utters *bl*, then *bl* once again, and finally he uses the *blin* (line 13) from his mother tongue Russian. Marat's *blin* is not initially heard clearly because his utterance overlaps with what Jose and Eshal say. Thus, Arvin asks him whether *bloody hell* or *bloody* were uttered as *blin* due to his Russian accent (line 19).

It is interesting to note here that neither Arvin nor any other interlocutor expresses any negative thoughts about it, even though they had enough time to do so during Arvin's pause for 2.6 seconds (line 19). Likewise, no interlocutor seems to have minded Arvin's non-standard *sweared* instead of *swore* (line 19), or his non-standard *founded* instead of *found* (line 22). Instead, all the

participants in this conversation seem to be interested in what their interlocutors say and rather than how they say it. The acceptance of *blin* in the conversation as an effort to sound more polite, first comes from Arvin. With his authoritative status as the president of the society, he seems to welcome Marat's clarification of *blin* with his *ok i see* in an enthusiastic rising intonation (line 41). Perhaps thanks to Arvin's enthusiasm, Marat takes the courage to continue and explain why he used *blin* here. As he says (lines 42-49), he usually avoids swearing when he is in Russia, but less so when he is abroad. And, because due to his character he actually does not actually want to swear, he prefers to use some Russian words with his English speaking interlocutors. The explanation of the reasons behind this word choice is followed by the interlocutors' ratification, and this is suggested here with Jose's *i agree i believe you it happens* (line 55) and finally again Arvin's affirmative *yes* (line 56). In this way, as it is argued here, Arvin achieves to be polite, and in particular he achieves this by means of the pragmatic sub-function '*displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English*'.

In addition to my argument about the pragmatic significance of the linguistic choice thanks to which Marat aimed at sounding more polite in this conversation, it is interesting to see what he himself had to say in our post-event interview.

Imagine saying a bad word, definitely, I admit it, that's swearing... But what if you're starting saying a bad word but then stopping half way or even earlier? Is it swearing? I don't think so!... If nobody notices, then it's not swearing... The

same, if you say a bad word in a different language, it's not swearing... So, yeah, sorry about the overall mess, but no sorry for swearing because none of us aaah did any swearing... We were polite, and the others saw that, they admitted that in the end.

(Marat)

Marat seems to be reiterating his previous explanation here, by talking about what he thinks constitutes swearing and what does not. In the first instance, he admits that “*saying a bad word*” is definite swearing. In the second instance, he includes “*starting saying a bad word but then stopping half way or even earlier*” and “*saying a bad word in another language*”. Also, it is interesting to note that Marat seems to acknowledge the importance of his interlocutors in ratifying the fact that what he did was not swearing and in turn that they appraised him as polite. Thus, according to his opinion, he did not swear. However, at this point, a note has to be made. Initially, I took the decision to name this pragmatic sub-function ‘*displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity*’, that is, without the addition of ‘*in English*’, thus meaning that there had not been any swearing at all. This is what Marat was arguing as well as what his interlocutors agreed on in the end. However, from an analytical point of view, it seemed to me that swearing had taken place indeed, albeit in a different language and not in English. For this reason, this pragmatic sub-function here was named ‘*displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English*’. This acknowledges the fact that Marat had did display a certain amount of discursive sensitivity by means of avoiding profanity, while at the same time it is cautious enough to clarify that this was the case with reference to English only.

5.3.3. 'Madar chod'

(Urdu: 'माँ कमीने' / Meaning: 'mother fucker' / Participants: Eshal - L1

Urdu, Jose - L1 Spanish, Breno - L1 Portuguese)

The following extract is also taken from the second meeting of the students' society. At some point, the students were wondering whether their colleagues would recognise their efforts and join their society. They particularly contrast their society with a society in another college. Eshal gets surprised at hearing that the other society has 1,500 members and is ready to exclaim *mother fucker*, but instead she uses *madar chod* from Urdu, her mother tongue. As she explains, she did so in order to avoid the Standard English expression *mother fucker*, which she deems to be inappropriate for this conversation with her colleagues. As it will also be shown, *mother fucker* was discontinued in English and was replaced by *madar chod* in Urdu in this extract in the same way that the English *bloody hell* was replaced by *blin* in Russian in the previous one.

- | | | |
|----|--------------|--|
| 1 | Eshal | so do you guys think our society will be successful? (.) |
| 2 | | i mean certainly all of us are now exciting excited |
| 3 | | but you know after a few months or next year (.) |
| 4 | | hahahaha i hope others like what we're doing |
| 5 | Jose | yeah i'm sure (.) |
| 6 | | because look i look at other societies at UCL |
| 7 | | and some of them are so↑ funny |
| 8 | | let's get together and have fun society ha |
| 9 | | dead people who used to have beard appreciation society= |
| 10 | Breno | =[hahaha] |
| 11 | Eshal | =[hahaha]ha |

- 12 **Breno** are you serious?
- 13 **Jose** really man (.)
- 14 yeah (.)
- 15 but but at the same time i know some other societies
- 16 really they are so good (.)
- 17 at UCL there's finance and economics society
- 18 or economics and finance
- 19 something like that anyway (.)
- 20 and someone told me that their president wrote on facebook (.)
- 21 it's crazy
- 22 and their members their number is are one thousand five hundred=
- 23 **Eshal** =mothe-↑ moth-↑ **madar chod**↑
- 24 **Breno** hahaha
- 25 **Jose** yeah but don't laugh i'm serious
- 26 one thousand and five hundred
- 27 **Breno** haha no sorry
- 28 i'm laughing at what <Eshal> was trying to say
- 29 that she is doing something with her mother
- 30 mother you know
- 31 [hahaha]
- 32 **Eshal** [hahaha] oh come on that's just a joke
- 33 and after all i didn't say anything bad
- 34 i was careful
- 35 i said it in urdu
- 36 **Breno** hahaha say it again then? **mad**=
- 37 **Eshal** =hahaha no haha i'm not saying it again
- 38 i said i'm careful i don't want to swear
- 39 **Breno** but you do you did
- 40 but it was just in your language hahaha
- 41 **Eshal** yeah sorry for that (.)
- 42 but you know in my language
- 43 in my language i don't think it's not so obvious (.)
- 44 i mean i know what it means
- 45 and now you made me tell you what it means
- 46 so you also know so it's the same now (.)

- 47 but before it was like unnoticed for others
 48 and for me it was like to want to say what i feel to say
 49 like without swearing
 50 (2.4)
 51 **Breno** so
 52 it's like the best of both worlds
 53 yeah?=
 54 **Eshal** =haha yeah you can say that
 55 **Jose** yeah it happens to me all the time when i spoke with foreign people
 56 **Breno** yea:::h same here
 57 **Eshal** see? i told you↑ hahaha

The discussion opens with Breno admitting (lines 14-21) that their society will never reach the level of popularity of some other societies, such as the economics and finance society of another college which he knows. As he explains, this society has already 1,500 members (lines 20-22). At hearing this large number, Eshal gets so surprised that she immediately latches and sets out to utter *mother fucker* to express her surprise (line 23). However, she seems to realise that *mother fucker* is a swear expression, and thus she does not deem it to be appropriate for this meeting. Thus, she discontinues at *mothe* (line 23). But it seems that she is so surprised at what she heard before and also it seems that her speech delivery rate is such that she goes on for a while more and starts uttering the same expression again. However, once again, she stops, this time at *moth* (line 23), arguably for the same reasons. But it seems that she still wants to express her surprise, and to do so she uses the expression *madar chod* from her mother tongue Urdu (line 23), whose first syllable is pronounced as the first syllable of *mother fucker* and whose meaning is the same.

This expression is not ignored by her interlocutors, and there starts a negotiation over whether *madar chod* constitutes a swear expression or not. Breno seems to be sure that it does. On the contrary, Eshal's opinion is that using *madar chod* in English is not a swear expression, that is, her opinion is that she was polite, and she argues that she *didn't say anything bad* (line 33), as she was *careful* enough (line 34) to say it *in urdu* (line 35). Still, although she argues that it was acceptable to use *madar chod* on that occasion, with her *no* and *i'm not saying it again* (line 37), she makes it clear that she does not want to repeat what she said before. It could be argued that this is so, because she believes that this time an explicit repetition or discussion of *madar chod* would bring it to the centre of attention in this conversation, and make it end up being a swear expression. As she continues, this was not the case with this expression until now, because saying it in another language makes it *not so obvious* (line 43) as well as *unnoticed by others* (line 47).

In addition to her argument, Eshal adds that what one gains from using a swear expression in another language is that one can say what one *feels to say* (line 48) but *without swearing* (line 49). Then, there is a pause of 2.4 seconds (line 50), the longest one in this conversation, which gives Eshal's interlocutors the time to appraise what she said so far. Breno, who until that moment is definite that Eshal sworn even by using *madar chod* in her mother tongue, now seems to be readjusting his position. He starts his sentence with the adverbial *so* (line 51), signalling that what he is going to say is somehow related with her previous argument. He continues by asking her whether what she just did is *the best of*

both worlds (line 52), and he finishes with *yeah* (line 53) making the whole sentence a tag question signalling that he waits for Eshal's final confirmation that he understands her argument sufficiently. Eshal immediately latches and agrees with him with her *yeah you can say that* (line 54). This leads Jorge to take the floor again, and he agrees with Breno and Eshal's argument with his *yeah* (line 56), as well as with his *same here* (line 56) he notes that this happens to him too when he interacts with speakers who come from different linguistic backgrounds. The conversation closes with Eshal's *see* and *i told you* followed by her repetitive cheerful laughter (line 57) signalling her contentment with the fact that her interlocutors finally agree with her. In this way, as it is shown in this extract, Eshal manages to exhibit some level of politeness towards her fellow interlocutors, and in particular it could be argued that the pragmatic sub-function '*displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English*' is achieved here. It is worth reiterating that, as is the case in the previous extract, '*in English*' was kept here as a way to discern what took place in this extract without wanting to take any particular side or in turn any particular decision regarding whether these cases constitute swearing or not.

5.4. Increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background

In the previous extracts, the students set out to maintain the level of politeness which they believe is necessary for their meetings, and they do so by using

words or phrases which belong to their mother tongue and which they use either translated in English or as they are found in their mother tongue. The following extract is different in three ways. First, it does not involve one student but two students who draw lexis from a language other than English. Second, these two students draw lexis not from their mother tongue or from another dialect or variety of English, but from each other's mother tongue. Third, because with this move they do not set out to maintain the current level of politeness of their meeting through avoiding a swear word or expression, as it is argued that is the case in the previous extracts, but to increase that level of politeness even more, by using lexis which belongs to the language background of their interlocutors, hence the pragmatic sub-function *'increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background'*. The analysis of the extract below shows that this had very positive consequences for what the students were discussing at that point.

Another point has to do with the fact that only one extract is chosen to be analysed here. Initially, there was a dilemma as to whether this amount of extracts could constitute a case. In other words, if that case is illustrated by examples which are so rare, whether it is worth discussing it. Still, the decision was taken that even that one example is able to constitute a case, and in turn that even such a rare case is worth discussing. After all, this is in line with the qualitative analytic paradigm which is adopted in this research study, whereby not only frequent cases but also rare ones are worth discussing as long as their

analysis shows them to be important and useful regarding providing answers to the research questions of this study.

5.4.1. 'Spacibo', 'xie xie'

(**'Spacibo'** - Russian: 'Спасибо' / **'Xie xie'** - Mandarin Chinese (hanzi): '谢谢' / **Meaning: 'thank you'** / **Participants: Breno - L1 Portuguese, Jose - L1 Spanish, Linlin - L1 Mandarin Chinese, Marat - L1 Russian)**

In this extract, taken from the second meeting of the students' society, after some compliments and pleasantries between Linlin and Marat, Linlin feels that she needs to thank Marat. However, she chooses to thank him not by using the English expression *thank you* or the Mandarin Chinese *xie xie*, but the Russian *spasibo*. In turn, Marat thanks her back using the Mandarin Chinese *xie xie* instead of the English *thank you* or the Russian *spacibo*.

- | | | |
|----|---------------|--|
| 1 | Linlin | yeah::: 'cause i think you're good |
| 2 | | yeah::: you're good (.) |
| 3 | | [and] |
| 4 | Marat | [haha] thanks↑ |
| 5 | | and and (.) |
| 6 | | ok i don't know how much of time we'll have free |
| 7 | | or if we are bored |
| 8 | | or tired |
| 9 | | (.) |
| 10 | Jose | we'll [see] |
| 11 | Breno | [yeah]= |
| 12 | Linlin | =and but at least for LSE we can be sure that that |
| 13 | | you know (.) that we'll have a responsible person= |

- 14 **Marat** =haha thanks↑
- 15 **Linlin** [ha]ha
- 16 **Jose** [so]
- 17 **Breno** [and]
- 18 **Marat** [ok] and i can say the same for you
- 19 KCL is really good too (.)
- 20 and we need someone you know
- 21 to to (.) you know we should know that we shouldn't worry
- 22 and i think you are you seem like this kind of person (.)
- 23 all the chinese i met are like that (.) kind
- 24 good people=
- 25 **Linlin** =oh::: you're so↑ nice
- 26 i should say thank you
- 27 you say this about my country
- 28 and why not
- 29 i should say this haha in your country in your language
- 30 to thank you even more
- 31 my best friend is russian
- 32 haha is is is it **spaciba**?=
- 33 **Marat** =hahahaha yes↑ yes↑
- 34 thank you hahaha
- 35 **spacibo spacibo** actually
- 36 but yeah (.) yours is ok too haha
- 37 **Linlin** i mean i want to say thank you in your language
- 38 because you said good things about
- 39 about my language eer i mean my country
- 40 **Marat** sure
- 41 **Breno** haha=
- 42 **Marat** =and i can do it in your language as well you know
- 43 i've lived in china for a while you know i told you (.)
- 44 and I had a good time good people
- 45 and I have a good opinion a positive feeling about you too
- 46 so (.) is it haha is it **xie xie**?
- 47 **Linlin** hahahaha **xie xie** hahahaha
- 48 sure

49 Jose hahahahaha

Further to their agreement for common action which they reached during the previous moments of their meeting, Linlin and Marat continue with exchanging compliments and pleasantries (lines 1-24). For instance, Linlin talks to Marat and mentions twice *you're good* (lines 1 and 2) and also calls him *a responsible person* (line 13). In return, Marat pays back the nice comments with saying *i can say the same for you* (line 18), and he continues by emphasising her kindness, something which he attributes to her Chinese background. As he says, *all the chinese that i met are like that* (line 23). At this point, Linlin seems to be so pleased with Marat and his good words about her and the people of her home country, that she mentions explicitly that she feels the need to thank him, *i should say thank you* (line 26), as she says. What is interesting is that Linlin hears Marat's nice words for her fellow Chinese people and she mentions that she wants to thank him in his language (lines 28-29). Some light can be shed on her intention to do so considering the fact that she mentions to Marat that she wants to thank him in his language for a particular reason, *to thank you even more*, as she characteristically explains (line 30). That is, she believes that by saying *thank you* to Marat in English her politeness will not be signalled sufficiently enough, but that she will sound more polite if she thanks him in his own mother tongue. Thus, she recalls *spacibo* from Russian and thanks him this way (line 32). Linlin's decision to thank Marat in his mother tongue seems to be a successful one, as Marat welcomes it enthusiastically. First, he immediately latches to reply to her and he continues with a repetitive appreciative laughter and a *double yes* in a rising intonation which shows his

enthusiasm (line 33). After that, he continues with a *thank you* and some amiable laughter too (line 34).

What is also very interesting to note is that, in return, Marat does exactly the same for Linlin (lines 41-46). He repeats that he has a positive opinion about her and the people of her country, as well as that he has lived in her country in the past for a while, and he also goes on to show his politeness by thanking her back in her mother tongue. Thus, instead of the English *thank you*, he uses the Mandarin Chinese *xie xie* (line 46). His decision to do so also seems to be a successful one. Linlin replies with some welcoming appreciative laughter, and also she accommodates to Marat and repeats his *xie xie* (line 47). She also continues by saying *sure* as a further signal of her welcoming attitude towards Marat's initial *xie xie* (line 48). Finally, it is also worth noting that, in addition to Linlin and Marat's ratification of each other's *spacibo* and *xie xie* respectively and the politeness which they increased this way, Breno's short laughter (line 41) and Jose's more extended laughter (line 49) also seem to testify to the positive way in which they took their interlocutors' strategic decisions to thank each other even more, by means of respectively using *spacibo* and *xie xie* from each other's mother tongue instead of the English *thank you*. The argument made here is that, this way, Linlin and Marat are successful in their effort to be even more polite compared to what they were until that moment, and in particular they are successful in achieving the pragmatic sub-function '*increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background*'.

In the metalinguistic comments of the post-event interviews presented so far, students were discussing their own linguistic choices. Quite differently, below, Marat comments not only on his own *xie xie* but also on Linlin's *spacibo*. While the analysis of this extract was taking place, Marat's comments proved to be very helpful towards a better understanding of the significance which these linguistic choices had in this conversation in terms of discerning the achieved pragmatic function.

<Linlin> is such a nice person, and at that moment, you can see it too, she wanted to show me that she is nice and she wanted to say *thank you* to me... she wanted to be more polite for her and for me... and because she knows that I'm Russian she said *thank you* in Russian... so, *spasibo*... She wanted to make her *thank you* even more special and precious... And, you know, the same for me, I mean, since I had lived in China before and of course I remembered some Mandarin Chinese I used *xie xie* for the same reason, why not?

(Marat)

In this extract, it is worth noting the certainty with which Marat expresses his belief that Linlin's used *spacibo* due to some kind of awareness of the way that speakers can thank their interlocutors in order to sound more polite. As he characteristically mentions, Linlin employed *spacibo* because "*she wanted to make her thank you even more special and precious*". Thus, what Marat says here seems to corroborate the point made earlier, that Linlin used *spacibo* from Marat's mother tongue and thus she was successful in '*increasing politeness by showing awareness of his interlocutor's linguistic background*'. Likewise, later

on in his comments, Marat also explicitly refers to the reason behind his decision to do the same. As he said, he used *xie xie* from Linlin's linguistic background "*for the same reason*", that is, he was also driven by the functional-pragmatic motivation of '*increasing politeness by showing awareness of his interlocutor's linguistic background*'. It should be noted that in this extract too, Marat acknowledges the paramount importance of his interlocutor, Linlin, in the co-achievement of politeness. He explicitly makes reference to the fact that both Linlin and he understand her use of *spacibo* as motivated by her wish "*to be more polite for her and for me*". In other words, Marat seems to realise that it is not enough for speakers to set out to sound polite for their own sake, hence *for her*, but mainly for the benefit of their interlocutors, hence *for me* too.

5.5. Discussion

This chapter continues with the discussion of the findings presented above, looking at them from the perspective of the first research question, which relates to the identification of wordings and features of discourse which emerge in ELF conversations. To begin with, as in the previous chapter, it is also important to discuss here the extensive range regarding many aspects of the lexis which the students draw from all across their linguistic repertoire. For instance, regarding the grammatical categories of these lexical items, *spacibo* and *xie xie* are verbs (extract 5.4.1), *i have seeds* is a verb phrase (extract 5.3.1), *blin* (5.3.2) is a noun, and *madar chod* (5.3.3) is an adjective phrase. Also, Linlin's *i have seeds*

is an idiomatic expression (extract 5.3.1), unlike the other lexical items included here. As regard the languages themselves, *blin* (extract 5.3.2) and *spacibo* (extract 5.4.1) come from Russian, *xie xie* (extract 5.4.1) and *i have seeds* (extract 5.3.1) from Mandarin Chinese, and *madar chod* (extract 5.3.3) from Urdu.

Much of this lexis is drawn from the students' mother tongues, such as Linlin's Mandarin Chinese *i have seeds* (extract 5.3.1), Marat's Russian *blin* (extract 5.3.2), and Eshal's Urdu *madar chod* (extract 5.3.3). On the other hand, some of the students draw lexis from their interlocutors' mother tongue. This is the case of Linlin who uses *spacibo* from Russian when she talks to Marat, who is Russian, and likewise when Marat does the same when he uses *xie xie* from Mandarin Chinese during his conversation with Linlin (extract 5.4.1). It is also interesting to note that while Marat's *blin* (extract 5.3.2), Eshal's *madar chod* (extract 5.3.3), Linlin's *spacibo* and again Marat's *xie xie* (extract 5.4.1) were used as they appear in their respective languages, Linlin thought of *you zhong* in her mother tongue Mandarin Chinese but then used it translated into English as *i have seeds*.

Additionally, it is important to reiterate the importance of the context. As shown in the analysis of each extract above, before students' translanguaging, there are a lot of comments from their fellow interlocutors with which they show their positive appraisal of one another's propositions. For instance, Marat (line 8, extract 5.3.1) shows that he agrees with Linlin's description of her personality by

saying *hmmm good tell us more*, and Jose (line 5, extract 5.3.3) shows his agreement with Eshal's belief about the future of their society with his *yeah i'm sure*. It can thus be argued that the collaborative and co-operative context of this conversation contributed to allowing the students draw linguistic elements from across their linguistic repertoire. Again, this echoes similar findings in other ELF studies which are discussed in the previous chapter (Cogo and Dewey 2006, 2012; Dewey 2007, 2011), in which the linguistic creativity in the conversations also emerged in a context where participants supported and collaborated with one another.

Closely related to the students' co-operation and collaboration is the interest which the students show in their lexis. The sequential analysis (Li 1998) of these moments shows that the students were overall involved and interested in and sometimes enthusiastic about what had been said. There is evidence of this in the extensive use of subsequent latching, direct confirmations, back-channellings, sentence completions, interjections, instances of enthusiastic rising intonation and moments of laughter. For instance, Jose (line 29, extract 5.3.1) overlaps with Linlin, and in particular his utterance features a double laughter, an affirmative *ok*, and the verb phrase *i see* uttered in a lengthened way, all of which suggest some kind of confirmation and positive appraisal of Linlin's previous utterance. The importance of this confirmation and positive appraisal lies in the fact that subsequently Linlin provides the explanation as to why she opts for the Mandarin Chinese expression instead of the Standard English one.

The interest which the students show in their conversations each time an interlocutor uses lexis from other linguistic sources can be seen from another perspective too. As the analysis of the extracts reveal above, every time such an item is used and interlocutors do not know its meaning, they immediately ask about it. For instance, Marat (line 13, extract 5.3.1), with his interrogative *what?*, shows that he is interested in knowing more about Linlin's *i have seeds*, followed by an attempt to provide an explanation of this expression himself (lines 15-20). In addition, students do not only show interest in their interlocutors' lexis, but sometimes they also accommodated to it. This is the case with Jose, who uses Linlin's expression *i have seeds* in order to compliment her on her decision to use this expression, mentioning to her that *you had the seeds to do that* (line 35, extract 5.3.1). As in the previous chapter, this suggests that the 'let-it-pass' principle (Firth 1996), whereby the interlocutors let the conversation continue even if they have not understood an utterance, was not found here.

Moreover, it is important to highlight that the students' translanguaging, as outlined in the previous chapter, found to contribute to the achievement of various pragmatic functions. Although drawing language items from various sources is seen in various code-switching studies to be motivated by linguistic deficiency, whereby the speakers do not know or can not remember a particular word, and thus they have to resort to their mother tongue in order to compensate for this lack of knowledge (e.g. McClure 1981, Zentella 1997), this is not found to be the case in the extracts analysed here. In the same vein,

although previous politeness-related studies (e.g. Brown and Levinson 1987; Lakoff 1973, 1977; Leech's 1983) treated the conversations of speakers from differing sociocultural backgrounds as challenging, because of which speakers need to take some action to ensure politeness and overcome cultural differences, this is also not found in these extracts. Instead, the analysis here shows that every time the students had knowledge of the equivalent Standard English word or phrase or expression, as well as they had awareness of their strategic decision regarding their linguistic choices. With particular reference to swearing (see also Dewaele 2004), the analysis showed that the students preferred not to swear in English, and they actually utilised all their linguistic resources for that matter. In doing so, the students were found to be successful in being polite by means of *'displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English'* and *'increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background'*. The above also expand our understanding of how politeness is achieved in ELF conversations, and in turn they expand the list of functions which have been discerned so far in politeness-related ELF studies (e.g. Metsä-Ketelä 2006; Pölzl 2009; Pullin Stark 2009, 2010; Riekkinen 2010), as discussed in the introductory part of this chapter.

Finally, it could be argued that the politeness-related function and sub-functions identified in the analysis of this chapter also sheds more light on the practice of translanguaging. As shown, drawing lexis from all the linguistic sources which the speakers had available, no matter whether these were their mother tongue, or another language available in their repertoire, or whether this is their or their interlocutors' language, was found to be a practice which helped students

achieve their communicative objectives. This resonates with the findings of various other studies discussed earlier, such as the ones within the paradigm of translanguaging (e.g. Creese and Blackledge 2010; Garcia and Li 2014; Li and Zhu 2010; Lin 2006, 2012). Finally, the findings also shed some light regarding communicative competence and how it can be expanded in view of findings from research on conversations between speakers from differing linguacultural backgrounds (see e.g. Leung 2005, 2013). The second research question of this research study calls for the implications of the above, and this will be the focus of a subsequent chapter.

5.6. Summary

This chapter is conceptually related to the previous one. In the previous chapter, the focus is on the translanguaging practices of the students' meetings during their studies, from the perspective of the function *'making specific meaning'* and the sub-functions *'filling in a lexical gap'* and *'using some more precise lexis'* which were found to be achieved. This chapter also looks at translanguaging, however, it does so with a particular focus on investigating how the students were achieving politeness during these meetings. The analysis of the extracts of this chapter found that the students were drawing extensively linguistic elements from all their linguistic backgrounds or from the linguistic background of their interlocutors, and they were using them either as they appear in the source language or translated into English. With their

translanguaging, they were setting out to sustain or to increase the level of politeness which they deemed necessary for their conversation in their meetings. In so doing, it was found that they were achieving politeness, and in particular from a pragmatic perspective they were achieving two politeness-related sub-functions. The first one is *'displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity'* and the second one is *'increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background'*.

CHAPTER 6.

ATTAINING CULTURAL APPROPRIATENESS BY MEANS OF NEGOTIATION

6.1. Introduction

This chapter looks at how the international students who participated in this research study were negotiating the meaning and use of culturally contested expressions, and how they were thus achieving various pragmatic functions with regard to attaining or retaining cultural appropriateness in their meetings. First, the construct of the negotiation is discussed, and is linked to the ability of language to adapt in order to suit the needs of the speakers who use it and the contexts in which it is used. Some perspectives on negotiation are also reviewed, such as negotiation of meaning, negotiation for meaning, and Negotiation with capital D. Subsequently, there is a focus on various studies which explicitly look at the cultural background of the interlocutors. Then, it is clarified that the particular focus of this chapter is on how students were negotiating in order to propose revisions of expressions which they considered to be culturally contested and which they were setting out to refine or replace through idiom variation and re-metaphorisation. Drawing on the analysis of the extracts in this chapter, it is thus shown that the students were achieving the pragmatic function '*maintaining cultural appropriateness*', as well as two

pragmatic sub-functions, *'refining the culturally contested elements of an expression'* and *'replacing a culturally contested expression altogether'*.

6.2. Outlining the relevant concepts and notions

In the previous chapter, social interactions are investigated from the perspective of politeness, as it is argued that achieving politeness is a key factor regarding their smooth continuation, but at the same time it is not a straightforward one due to the wide range of ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds of people in contemporary conditions. In this chapter, the focus remains on social interactions of people from diverse linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds, but this time the focus is the negotiation which has to take place in order for the participants to ensure some level of cultural appropriateness. For that matter, the notion of negotiation is first discussed below, and this is followed by a review of how the role of culture is researched in the interaction of people with a diverse linguistic and sociocultural background. Over the years, there have been developed various theoretical and analytical models which have looked at negotiation as an identifiable practice in which the participating parties are involved, putting forward their positions, expressing their will to receive replies, counter-replying showing their agreement or disagreement, and so on. For instance, thus understood, negotiation has been investigated extensively in high stake contexts such as business meetings and international diplomacy, looking

at the strategies which are employed during these events and the way that outcomes are dealt with (Lewicki et al 2003).

In the field of applied linguistics and in particular SLA, negotiation has also been researched as a micro-level mechanism from the perspective of the linguistic adjustments which the interactants make in order to achieve understanding and communicate. In particular, negotiation was thus extensively researched in the framework of what came to be known as negotiation of meaning, which concerns mainly referential meaning. Although negotiation of meaning is mostly researched from the perspective of its role in language pedagogy, a better understanding of it shows that it also has some elements which can potentially prove methodologically and analytically useful regarding a better understanding of non-pedagogical interactions as well. For that matter, a brief outline of negotiation of meaning is first provided here. A widely used definition of this construct is the following (Long 1996: 418):

Negotiation of meaning is the process in which, in an effort to communicate, learners and competent speakers provide and interpret signals of their own and of their interlocutors' perceived comprehension, thus provoking adjustments to linguistic form, conversational structure, message content, or all three.

As it is mentioned above, studies on negotiation of meaning in SLA are concerned with the learning process itself, and try to shed light on it by investigating how L2 speakers achieve understanding in communication (see e.g. Long 1983a, b; Pica and Young 1986; Varonis and Gass 1985a). To this

end, data are collected from NS-NNS interactions. As it is argued in these studies, the reason behind the collection of data from NS-NNS interactions is that NSs can recognise relatively easily the ways that their NNS interlocutors signal their misunderstanding of what is said, for instance, through lack of replies, wrong replies, and requests for help such as with clarification requests and confirmation checks. In the same vein, it is also argued that NSs can check their NNS interlocutors' understanding or lack of it through conversational moves, for instance, through comprehension checks. As a result, it is believed that NS can modify their speech by justifying their message or their speaking rate or by simplifying their lexis. This way, as the studies above add, the NNSs benefit from the speech modification of the NS during the instances of negotiation of meaning with them, in so far as this contributes to their language development. In addition, since it is believed that negotiation of meaning between NS and NNS brings about benefits for the NNSs' language development, it is also sought to be found whether there are benefits for their language developments in cases of negotiation of meaning with other NNS interlocutors too. For that matter, studies also investigate the interactions between NNSs-NNSs who come either from the same or from a different L1 background (e.g. Long 1983c; Pica et al. 1996; Varonis and Gas 1982, 1985b).

This chapter takes on board many of the underlying tenets of the rich body of research on negotiation of meaning, but at the same time it departs from many other ones as well. For instance, as mentioned above, one of the main tenets of the studies on negotiation of meaning is that NNSs are seen as language

learners who benefit from interacting with NS. However, as explained earlier in the section which outlines the theoretical framework of this study, the NS-NNS distinction is refuted here on the grounds that ELF research is not underpinned by any linguistic deficit perspective. In turn, NNs are not considered as failed NS but as speakers in their own right. What this means for this chapter is that the international students' linguistic choices which are discussed here are not seen as having been made in a way that should be different in order to conform to NS conventions, or so as for them to make up for any kind of linguistic deficiency. Instead, the students' linguistic choices are discussed here as legitimate ways that were employed in order for them to achieve their communicative objectives and in turn in order for effective communication to take place.

The result, and this is what this chapter has in common with the research on negotiation of meaning, is that at certain points language has to be modified. In other words, exactly as the studies on negotiation of meaning tend to refer to speakers trying out alternative expressions to make meaning, the focus of this chapter too is on speakers who also set out to modify their language in order to fulfil their communicative objectives. In particular, this chapter looks at the naturally occurring spoken discourse of the students who participated in this research study in order to investigate how modified various ENL formulaic expressions in their ELF interactions in order to make them culturally appropriate. However, for that matter, one more difference between studies on negotiation of meaning and this chapter is that the former tend to yield findings

which have to do with speakers following NS forms and norms. On the contrary, the findings of this chapter show that the students were modifying various formulaic expressions according to their communicative objectives in a way that does not conform to NSs conventions, as it is shown below.

Finally, with regard to negotiation of meaning, some caveats are in order before moving on. One of them has to do with the fact that negotiation of meaning is treated here as a process related to the interaction of speakers. That is, although this construct is extensively utilised with reference to specific pedagogical contexts (see e.g. Foster and Snyder Ohta 2005 for the pedagogical role of negotiation of meaning in peer assistance in tasks and other information-gap activities), the focus in this chapter remains the negotiation of meaning in the students' interactions in their meetings. Another note has to do with the term 'negotiation of meaning' as opposed to 'negotiation for meaning' (e.g. Block 2002). The latter term takes the perspective that there is no meaning in the first place, thus the speakers have to negotiate in order to co-construct it. Hence, 'of' is not as appropriate as 'for'. The third perspective on negotiation, the one in which Negotiation is with capital D, is discussed further below. However, because it relates to intercultural studies and culture in general, these two are discussed more immediate here.

As mentioned above, the students were modifying various ENL formulaic expressions which they considered culturally contested in order for them to be more culturally appropriate. Cultural appropriateness, it could be argued,

belongs to the wider family of topics which are investigated in studies which take a cultural perspective to look at communication between speakers from differing sociocultural backgrounds. The communication of this kind and in particular the interplay of cultural diversity and language practice take on a growing importance in our increasingly ethnolinguistically diverse societies. Thus, there is now an array of respective research studies in the field of enquiry of intercultural studies, with the agenda to investigate how people's cultural norms and beliefs affect their linguistic and communicative practices, and in particular to see how the above lead to non- or mis-understandings. Among others, there is research trying to identify culture-specific ways of communication which deem challenging, such as directness versus indirectness (Katriel 1986) and high versus low involvement (Tannen 1984), class of communication styles (Bailey 1997) and mismatch in cultural stereotypes and schemas (Nishida 2005). Not limited to words, intercultural studies also set out to identify differences in the use of silences (Jaworski 2000), turn taking patterns (Eades 2000) and expressions of emotions (Matsumoto and Hwang 2012).

Scollon and Scollon (1995, 2001) and Scollon, Scollon and Jones (2012) focus on speakers who come from western and Asian backgrounds, and in particular they look at the way that they interact in corporate and other professional contexts, from the perspective of the rhetorical organisation of their discourse. For instance, they highlight the inductive rhetorical strategy of the westerners and the deductive one of the Asian speakers. Further to these, Cheng (2003)

discusses intercultural communication from a variety of discourse features, such as interruptions, overlaps, compliments, and so on. Quite similarly, Zhu (2014) examines how intercultural communication permeates speakers' lives at their workplace and business situations, as well as other moments of their lives such as when travelling or studying abroad during which they have to appraise humour. Interestingly enough, although the above studies discuss various differences in the way that speakers from differing sociocultural backgrounds communicate in various settings, what is also highlighted is what these speakers can do to achieve appropriate and efficient intercultural communication.

Such research considerations resonate with work undertaken from an ELF perspective too. Surely, ELF research by default takes into consideration the fact that it looks at communication of speakers from differing linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds. However, what I mean here is that there is a certain body of ELF-related studies in which the interplay between language and culture becomes the central point of attention by this being what is investigated rather than only informing the study while there is another topic to be investigated. With reference to specific research on culture then, intercultural communication studies and ELF research have a significant cross-over. In particular, both these paradigms problematise accounts which correlate language and culture in an essentialistic fashion. In turn, both these paradigms seek to illustrate the dynamic relationships between language and culture as well as the fluid way that language is used. For instance, these are the

underlying tenets of the intercultural studies discussed above. Likewise, as is multifariously shown in this study, within the paradigm of ELF, English is no longer seen as inexorably associated with the Anglophone contexts from which it originated. Instead, cultures are “conceived as liminal, emergent resources that are in a constant state of fluidity and flux between local and global references, creating new practices and forms in each instance of Intercultural Communication” (Baker 2009: 568). Last but not least, both of these paradigms seek to highlight instances of successful communication across linguistic and cultural borders. Just to illustrate this with an example from ELF research, Baker (2015) looks at intercultural communication by means of examining the interplay between language, culture and identity, in order to examine what intercultural competence means in ELF contexts.

A perspective which aims at bringing together insights from the studies on negotiation, intercultural communication and ELF is taken in Zhu (2014). Zhu puts forward Negotiation, with capital D, to differentiate it from negotiation in activity types such as negotiations in business meetings, which are mentioned above. She also differentiates Negotiation with capital D from the negotiation in the way that is treated in the construct of negotiation of meaning. As she explains, “Negotiation is not limited to the understanding of meaning, linguistic or otherwise” (p. 64). In terms of the research agenda of Negotiation, she seems to move away from the traditional intercultural approach, which attributes problems in interactions involving participants from different cultural backgrounds to culture. Instead, as she explains, the focus of Negotiation is on

how individuals make use of their different linguistic and cultural resources in order to negotiate understanding. In that sense, Negotiation with capital D seems to be more in congruence with the ELF perspective for that matter, or, as Seidlhofer (2009a: 242) puts it, the “ad hoc, situated negotiation of meaning”. The above position informs the analysis of the extracts of this chapter too, as the focus here is a culture-related perspective on the language of the speakers who come from differing linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds, with a view to shed more light on what they set out to negotiate, in what way, and for what reason, in their effort to achieve their communicative objectives.

As it is also mentioned above, the analysis of the extracts of this chapter revolves around expressions which the students set out to negotiate and adapt and which belong to so-called formulaic language. In particular, it finds that the vast majority of these formulaic expressions were idioms. Thus, before moving on to the analysis of the extracts, it is worth being clear with regard to what counts as formulaic language and as an idiom. With regard to formulaic language, it is important to note that the classification and analysis differs widely between researchers (but see e.g. Wray 2002 for a comprehensive survey). However, it is generally understood that language of this kind is made up of chunks of words which are used together rather than of word sequences which can be used with or without one another in Standard English. In the types and examples of formulaic language which Swan (2006: 5) provides, there are chunks which he calls idiomatic fixed phrases (e.g. ‘break even’) or non-idiomatic ones (e.g. ‘out of work’), situationally-bound preferred formulae (e.g.

‘sorry to keep you waiting’), frames (e.g. ‘if I were you’) and collocations (e.g. ‘blazing row’). Another name which Mel’čuk (1998: 23) gives to collocations is set phrases. To the above, one could also add wishes (e.g. ‘happy birthday’ and ‘bon appetite’), since these words are traditionally thought to appear together when it comes to the respective formulaic chunks. The category of wishes is emphasised here, since the analysis of one of the extracts below revolves around such a wish, while all other chunks in this chapter are idioms. Thus, some clarification is also needed as to what is considered to be an idiom

An idiom is a multiple word unit or chunk which has a metaphorical meaning but whose literal meaning is different (Cuddon and Preston 1998). In other words, idioms contradict the principle of compositionality, in so far as the meaning of the whole is not construed from the meaning of its parts (Werning, Machery and Schurz 2005). Semantically, idioms can be divided into several types. For instance, Kövecses and Szabó (1996) divide idioms into metaphors (e.g. ‘spill the beans’), metonymies (e.g. ‘throw up one’s hands’), similes (e.g. ‘as easy as pie’), hyperboles (e.g. ‘not in a million years’), proverbs or sayings (e.g. ‘a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush’), and so on. In terms of form, idioms can be divided into lexemic and phraseological ones (Lattey 1986). Lexemic idioms are composed of a verb phrase and a noun phrase, as in ‘spill the beans’, whereas phraseological idioms can include several parts of speech, as in the case of proverbs and sayings, e.g. ‘a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush’.

According to Howarth (1998: 28), there are what he calls pure idioms (e.g. ‘blow the gaff’) and figurative idioms (e.g. ‘blow my own trumpet’). These two are

placed in this order at the end of a continuum of lexical composites, according to whether their constituent lexical items can appear in free variation or not. Before them come what he calls restricted collocations (e.g. 'blow a fuse') and free combinations (e.g. 'blow a trumpet').

It is interesting to note that, the ELT literature, formulaic language is also often taken as a token of high proficiency. For instance, Wray (2002) is of the opinion that formulaic sequences are aimed at because they seem to hold the key to native-like idiomaticity. In the same vein, Howarth (1998: 38) argues that "the ability to manipulate such clusters is a sign of true native speaker competence and is a useful indicator of degrees of proficiency across the boundary between non-native and native competence". Similarly, Cowie (1992: 10) argues that "[i]t is impossible to perform at a level acceptable to native users, in writing or in speech, without controlling an appropriate range of multiword units". Finally, Galperin (2009: n.a.) comments that "[l]anguage chunks are definitely one of the main ingredients of successful transition to the advanced levels of English". It is beyond the scope of this section to repeat the inherent difficulties in delineating what native or native-like competence may be, as this is extensively discussed in earlier sections. However, it is important to keep in mind the above arguments regarding formulaic language chunks, since the analysis of the extracts of this chapter below do not show students' interest or effort to use them in a way that would conform to any ENL model, nor in terms of their supposed fixedness. On the contrary, the students are found to adapt their own

or their interlocutors' formulaic chunks, thus bending any pre-arranged ENL norms and fixedness, in order to achieve their communicative objectives.

In that sense, that is, not conforming to ENL norms and conventions but being adapted in order to help speakers achieve their communicative objectives, formulaic expressions have received considerable attention in ELF research. For instance, Seidlhofer and Widdowson (2007) and Seidlhofer (2009b) investigate the idiom principle (cf. Sinclair 1991) and how it is realised in ELF encounters. As they show, idiomatic expressions are often constructed online, atomistically and in a bottom-up fashion, which they see as part and parcel of what they call 'open-choice principle' (Seidlhofer and Widdowson 2007: 365). In turn, these idiomatic expressions make sense only in the specific group of interlocutors who take part in a specific conversation. Also, as Seidlhofer and Widdowson add, these idioms in ELF conversations include different wordings from their equivalent ENL ones. Thus, the ELF idiom principle may operate outside conventionalised ENL idiomatic usage. On another note, the idiomatic expressions in ELF generally lack what Seidlhofer and Widdowson call 'territorial imperative' (p. 368). That is, while in ENL there is a link between the idioms and the need of the speakers to use them in order to project their social identity and group membership, that is, their 'territory', ELF speakers may not feel the need to establish or sustain such affiliations through the use of idioms. These points are also taken up in two interrelated ways regarding the idiomatic expressions which are analysed in this chapter. First, the idioms here are also adapted and realised with different wordings. Second, through this adaptation

which results in their realisation with different wordings, these different wordings go beyond their initial 'territorial imperative'.

Building on the above considerations of Seidlhofer and Widdowson, Pitzl (2009) discusses the fact that ENL idiomatic expressions are culturally tethered and fixed, whereas the idiomatic expressions in ELF are rather a case of interlocutors coining mutually agreed idioms through what she calls 're-metaphorisation' (p. 307). For instance, in her data, the metaphor which underlies the established and fixed ENL idiom '*let sleeping dogs lie*' is 're-awakened' by a speaker who uses the expression '*we should not wake up any dogs*'. Pitzl thus identifies a variety of pragmatic functions, such as "*providing emphasis*", "*increasing explicitness*", "*elaborating on a point*", "*talking about abstract concepts*", "*furthering interpersonal rapport in dealing with tricky situations*", "*making a sensitive proposition*", "*adding humour into the discussion*" and "*bringing into the discussion the culture of a particular interlocutor*" (p. 317). To these functions, Pitzl (2012) adds even more, such as "*expressing subjectivity*", "*projecting stance*" and "*establishing rapport and solidarity*", achieved through what this time she calls 'idiom variation' (p. 27). The practices of idiom variation and re-metaphorisation mentioned here are also shown in the idioms looked at in this chapter too. Also, the above pragmatic functions are also important to keep in mind, as this present chapter looks at ELF interactions and identifies how the students use formulaic expressions in order to achieve their communicative objectives.

As mentioned above, the students in the extracts investigated below considered various expressions as culturally contested. In turn, they were setting out to negotiate and adapt them in order to make them more culturally appropriate for their conversations. In so doing, they were found to be achieving two pragmatic sub-functions. The first one is *'refining the culturally contested elements of an expression'*, and the second one was *'replacing a culturally contested expression altogether'*. These two sub-functions are illustrated below through the analysis of five extracts.

6.3. Refining the culturally contested elements of an expression

As mentioned above, the first of the sub-functions which are identified in the analysis of the extracts in this chapter is *'refining the culturally contested elements of an expression'*. This is illustrated below through the analysis of four extracts.

6.3.1. 'All the goods of Abraham'

(Greek: 'Όλα τα καλά του Αβραάμ'; romanised script: 'Ola ta kala tou

Avraam' / Meaning: 'All the goods that someone can provide' / Refined as:

'All the goods of all the saints', 'all the goods under the sun' /

Participants: Breno - L1 Portuguese, Halim - L1 Arabic, Leonidas - L1 Greek)

The extract below is taken from the very first moments of the fourth meeting of the student society. While the students are getting ready to start the meeting, Leonidas starts describing his vision for their society's members. In particular, he mentions that ideally everyone should be able and willing to offer one another *all the goods of abraham*. This is an idiomatic expression used in Greek, albeit being a bit archaic and used mainly from older people nowadays, and it draws from the Christian religion. In this expression, Abraham is portrayed as a benevolent religious and political leader of the people of Israel back then. This brings about the reaction of Halim, who due to his Arabic background does not feel comfortable with being included among those who should offer to others *all the goods of abraham*. Thus, the students negotiate the meaning of this idiom and refine its culturally contestable elements.

- 1 **Leonidas** yes:::
- 2 because all of us (.)
- 3 i mean all of us you know
- 4 we are in good colleges
- 5 educated and international in experience
- 6 so i'm sure we know how to do things in the proper way (.)
- 7 but it's this notion that we must all have
- 8 you know this notion
- 9 of sharing and offering to others eeeh
- 10 **all the goods of abraham** if you know what i mean=
- 11 **Halim** = [who?]
- 12 **Breno** = [**of**] **abraham?**
- 13 **Leonidas** yes ye:::s
- 14 oh sorry i forgot
- 15 we say that in greece
- 16 because in greece most people are christians

- 17 and **abraham** was that important leader of the jewish people
 18 you know the jewish people are in the christian religion we have=
 19 =like i mean all of us should share and offer like him=
 20 Halim =[WAIT↑] wait wait
 21 Breno [but]
 22 (3.7)
 23 Halim look, <Leonidas>
 24 sharing yes, offering yes, like him no
 25 cannot accept it↑
 26 (1.9)
 27 Leonidas oh you mean that's too much
 28 like we're just students whereas he was the=
 29 Halim =no↑
 30 like some of us here we are just muslims
 31 and he was the king of the jew
 32 or whatever title he had anyway
 33 and muslims and jew even nowadays don't like each other (.)
 34 come on everybody knows that
 35 (.)
 36 Breno yeah <Leonidas> better rephrase that you said
 37 (1.6)
 38 Leonidas it's just an expression
 39 didn't want to cause any problem=
 40 =i mean (1.2)
 41 ahhh the:::n
 42 all **all the goods of all the saints**
 43 Halim sure (.) better=
 44 Breno = **all the goods under the sun?**
 45 because under the sun is that in english it means everything
 46 so:::==
 47 Halim =yeah
 48 i mean those two are ok now (.)
 49 yeah why not being absolutely fine
 50 Leonidas sure my mistake
 51 Halim everything is ok now

The conversation begins with Leonidas emphasising the importance of sharing and offering to others everything they all can, or, as he puts it, *all the goods of abraham* (line 10). However, because this idiomatic expression draws from the Christian religion, it immediately brings about Halim's reaction, as he comes from a Muslim background. Thus, Halim immediately responds and shows his level of involvement and interest in the conversation, and he seems to be interested in making sure that he heard correctly what Leonidas just said, as it is signalled by his confirmation request by means of using the personal pronoun *who* in an interrogative intonation (line 11). However, Leonidas' explanation and repetition that *all of us should share and offer like him [abraham]* (line 19) seem to be dispreferred for Halim, and get him even more frustrated. Thus, he immediately takes the floor, and he continues with three *wait* in the imperative mood (line 20), one of which is in a rising intonation showing some more disagreement too, thus challenging Leonida's proposition. As he explains to Leonidas, he is able and happy to share and offer but not like Abraham. As he says, *sharing yes, offering yes, like him no* (line 24), something which he also emphasises by adding that he *cannot accept it* (line 25), and by repeating his objection with his *no* in a latching stressed rising intonation (line 29). In addition, as he explains, *we are just muslims* (line 30), whereas *he was the king of the jew* (line 31), and *muslims and jew even nowadays don't like each other* (line 32). It could be added that Halim's objection to the idiomatic expression is also shown by the way that he chooses to refer to Abraham. He seems as if he wants to keep his distance even from the mere linguistic practice of

pronouncing his name, and instead he uses the pronouns *who* (line 11), *him* (line 19) and twice *he* (lines 31 and 32).

In the end, when Leonidas realises the reasons which make this idiomatic expression culturally contested, he apologises with his *didn't want to cause any problem* (line 39) and he immediately sets out to do something about it. For that matter, even he himself removes the contested proper name *abraham* and replaces it with the generic *all the saints*, thus making the idiom *all the goods of all the saints* (line 42). At this point, after Halim's objection and dissatisfaction a while ago, it is important to see how he takes Leonidas' refined expression.

With his *better sure better* (line 43), it could be argued that he now feels comfortable with it. Even better, Breno now joins the conversation and makes one more proposal, *all the goods under the sun* (line 44), which he justifies by saying that *under the sun is that in english it means everything* (line 45), that is, exactly what the original idiomatic expression means but without its contested elements. Halim seems to like this idiomatic expression too, as it becomes evident from his *yeah* (line 47), and he provides some kind of an overview of these two expressions by commenting positively on them and saying that *those two are ok now* (line 48). In this way, the extract above aims at showing how the students negotiated regarding the idiomatic expression which they did not consider culturally appropriate. In particular, it shows how they adapted it by refining its contested elements through idiom variation and re-metaphorisation, and thus how they turned into one which they then considered culturally

appropriate. Hence, the achievement of the pragmatic sub-function *'refining the culturally contested elements of an expression'*.

6.3.2. 'Bringing home the bacon'

(Meaning: 'Supply someone', 'provide support to someone' / Refined as: 'Bringing home some other kind of meat', 'bringing home whatever food is allowed', 'bringing us what we need' / Participants: Ales - L1 Slovakian, Arvin - L1 Mauritius Creole, Eshal - L1 Urdu, Frieda - L1 German, Marat - L1 Russian)

This is an extract from the fifth meeting of the society. At some point, Arvin proposes the idea that they could find some graduates of the University of London who have now managed to become important, and persuade them to attend a ceremony in which they would be accepted as honorary members of their society. Everyone seems to welcome this idea, and Ales adds that this way these honorary members would be *bringing home the bacon* for them, meaning that they would be a great help for their society. However, Eshal raises her objection to the use of this expression, as bacon is not allowed according to her Muslim background. Thus, the students negotiate and the controversial elements of the expression are refined in order to make it more culturally appropriate.

- 1 **Arvin** and also if you all agree
- 2 e:::rm what about honorary lifelong members?=
3 **Marat** =[what]

4 Ales = [what] is that?
5 Arvin ok let me explain (.)
6 university of london with its colleges and schools
7 has a lot of notable graduates (.)
8 so we could contact them and ask them
9 if i mean if they want to attend a small ceremony from us and
10 and become our lifelong sorry honorary lifelong members
11 (1.7)
12 Frieda ri[ght]
13 Marat [so] it's like the honorary phd degrees, right?
14 princess anne gives them to important personalities
15 during the foundation day of the university of london each november (.)
16 so a little bit of advertising for them
17 for the university too and everyone is happy
18 Arvin yes yes in a few words
19 (3.1)
20 Eshal i like↑ it a lot this idea
21 Frieda but but any notable graduate persons of the university of london?=
22 Marat = [there must be]
23 Arvin = [yes and i made] a small research and (.)
24 so::: the inventor of the telephone graham bell
25 the world famous politicians like j.f. kennedy [and ma]hatma gandhi
26 Frieda [oh wow]
27 Arvin the influential poet john keats=
28 Eshal =but all these are [are dead] [are]n't they?
29 Frieda [are dead]
30 Marat [hahahaha] [haha]
31 Arvin wait wait yeah these i just gave some examples (.)
32 but there are others who still live
33 like wait don't laugh i've noted them down these ones too
34 yeah like the famous businessman george soros
35 or the singer elton john and mick jagger from the rolling stones
36 Frieda yeah when i was applying here i've heard
37 i've read about [them on wiki]pedia
38 Eshal [yeah me too]

- 39 **Frieda** now i remembered
- 40 **Arvin** big names haha
- 41 **Ales** so the idea is that if and we really have to think if they accept to
- 42 if they accept our invitation to come to us
- 43 ok they don't need more publicity
- 44 but they'll help us
- 45 eerm you know they'll be **bringing home the bacon** for us, right? (1.1)
- 46 like they'll help us to get more publicity ourselves=
- 47 **Arvin** =yeap you got that (1.4)
- 48 [guys] what do you think?
- 49 **Eshal** [yes]
- 50 but sorry no **bringing home the bacon** for me however please=
- 51 **Arvin** =you you didn't like it the idea?
- 52 **Eshal** no i mean yes the idea is ok although difficult to make it real
- 53 sorry i mean the expression **bringing home the bacon** isn't for me
- 54 i mean i'm muslim and this is haram (.)
- 55 we don't eat bacon because it comes from pork
- 56 and <Ales> said [**they'll be bringing home the ba]con**
- 57 **Ales** [oh i'm so sorry then really so sorry]
- 58 **Eshal** yes↑
- 59 **Ales** yeah it was i- i- you know
- 60 idiomatic expression
- 61 like it says one thing but you mean another=
- 62 **Arvin** =but if <Eshal> likes the idea of these famous people to come to us
- 63 wouldn't mind if they don't **bring us bacon home** hahaha
- 64 but but hahaha **bringing home some other kind of meat**
- 65 or **bringing home whatever food is allowed**
- 66 or **bringing us whatever we need** anyway what d' you think?
- 68 [hahahahahaha]
- 69 **Eshal** [hahahaha you]'re so funny <Arvin>
- 70 i mean sure now
- 71 that's more how it should be
- 72 hahaha thanks haha but let's move on now it's late haha

After the students welcome the idea of honorary members in their society, Ales wants to elaborate on how these members can benefit them. Thus, he uses an ENL idiomatic expression and says that *they'll be bringing home the bacon* (line 45). However, Eshal objects to the use of this expression, due to her Muslim background. Thus, although she does express her agreement with the idea as a whole as signalled by her *yes* (line 49), she continues with her *but sorry no bringing home the bacon for me however please* (line 50). As Arvin's idea was received favourably by all the other interlocutors, he immediately enquires the reason of her negative reaction (line 51). This gives her the opportunity to clarify that she likes the idea, and that her disagreement has to do with the idiomatic expression itself. As she says, *the expression bringing home the bacon isn't for me* (line 53), and she justifies it with her *i'm muslim and this is haram* (line 54), and in particular *we don't eat bacon because it comes from pork* (line 55). Ales apologises with *oh i'm so sorry then really so sorry* (line 57), and he tries to justify himself on the basis that this is just an idiomatic expression which by definition means that *it says one thing but you mean another* (lines 60-61).

Arvin seems to understand Eshal's dissatisfaction with Ales' use of this particular expression, and he does not want this incident to have a negative impact on how this idea is taken up by the other members. Thus, he takes the floor and, in a very creative way and among some laughter and word repetitions which may reveal his uncertainty of how his fellow interlocutors will appraise what he is about to say, he refines the initially culturally contested expression. What he now uses is *bringing home some other kind of meat* (line 64), or

bringing home whatever food is allowed (line 65), or *bringing us whatever we need* (line 66). To these, Eshal's reply is important, as she was the one who first objected to that idiomatic expression, and thus her reply has extra weight regarding whether Arvin's proposal managed to constitute a refinement of the previously culturally contested elements. For that matter, with her repetitive enthusiastic laughter and her appraisal *you're so funny* (line 67), immediately afterwards with her *i mean sure now* (line 68) and her *that's more how it should be* (line 69), it seems that she is satisfied with the way that Arvin refined the contested ENL idiomatic expression into one which is culturally more appropriate. Finally, among laughter again, she also thanks him, thus showing her overall satisfaction now (line 70). It seems, then, that the students on this occasion were successful in negotiating in order to work on the culturally contested elements of the ENL idiomatic expression and to refine them into some more culturally accepted ones.

6.3.3. 'Hit the bull's eye'

(Meaning: 'Be spot on' 'achieve the goal perfectly' / Refined as: 'Hit the right target', 'hit in the right way', 'do it in the right way' / Participants:

Arvin - Mauritius Creole, Breno - L1 Portuguese, Halim - L1 Arabic, Shivani - L1 Hindi)

The extract analysed below is from the fourth meeting of the student society. At this particular moment, the members of the society are reviewing the requirements which are set by the University of London Union for the founding

of new societies. As they also have to meet these requirements in order for their society to be eventually accepted by the University of London, and as these requirements seem to be a lot and difficult to meet, all the students agreed that their application should manage to be persuasive, concise and precise, and generally to *hit the bull's eye*, as Breno characteristically says. However, because cows are sacred and protected animals in India, and by extension so are bulls too, this Standard English idiomatic expression brings about a negative reaction from Shivani due to her Indian background. Thus, the participants negotiate and refine this expression in order to make it more culturally acceptable. A point which is worth making here has to do with the section in which this extract should appear. In the end, the decision was taken for it to appear here, as the students propose two refinements of the culturally contested elements of the expression, and only one complete replacement of it as it the focus of the next section.

- 1 **Breno** and it says here that we have to submit this application first
- 2 and then also to go in front of a committee?
- 3 to present and argue why they should accept us as a new society? =
- 4 **Shivani** =and also i see here here that in ever every meeting
- 5 in every meeting we should have at least twenty members attending?
- 6 (2.2)
- 7 **Arvin** yeah unfortunately (.)
- 8 because i went there and i met the officer for all these
- 9 and i was asking her about all these
- 10 and she was agreeing that they are strict
- 11 but she was saying that that's the way it is take it or leave it =
- 12 **Halim** =but ok we like challenges no?
- 13 we'll make it happen =

- 14 **Breno** =we just have like
 15 to be like
 16 you know nothing more or nothing less
 17 right there
 18 spot on
 19 to **hit the bull's eye**
 20 [you know]
 21 **Shivani** [as long as] it's not an actual bull though hahaha=
 22 **Breno** =[as long as what?]
 23 **Halim** [what do you mean?]
 24 (1.1)
 25 **Shivani** eeeh you know (.)
 26 bulls and cows
 27 they're sacred for us in india
 28 we can't imagine hitting them
 29 (.)
 30 **Breno** oh yeah sorry i remember that
 31 because years ago when there was this disease of mad cows
 32 in india you they didn't know what to do
 33 whether they should kill the cows and the bulls because they had it
 34 or let them leave because they are holy animals as you said now
 35 **Shivani** yeah i know that
 36 and not only killing but also hitting and also even saying hitting
 37 come on <Breno> you can't you can't even say that
 38 to **hit the bull's eye**
 39 i mean so many expressions and so many animals
 40 why this one these ones?
 41 is there any reason?
 42 no reason at all
 42 (2.3)
 43 **Breno** i::: i::: (.)
 44 to tell you the truth
 45 although you you'll not like it
 46 i think it's from the bull fightings in spain
 47 that in the end the bull fighters were killing the bulls=

- 48 **Shivani** =no↑
 49 and I think it had to be with no blood but with technique
 50 so you know **hitting the bull's eye**=
 51 **Shivani** =stop that please↑
 52 too much
 53 not want to hear about that anymore
 54 **Breno** sorry
 55 but that's the reason
 56 and expression is because of this reason
 57 and i guess now it just exists and it is used
 58 **Shivani** i don't care it can and it should be changed
 59 (2.5)
 60 **Halim** so <Shivani> you think something like
 61 like to **hit the right target**
 62 or **hit in the right way** perhaps
 63 these would be ok i think now right?
 64 **Breno** or to **do it in the right way**?
 65 so you know no no hitting in it at all
 66 yeah so no cruelty against animals at all
 67 against bulls or cows or anything
 68 even more peaceful this way
 69 **Shivani** ↑can't agree more with you guys↑
 70 thank you

After the initial thoughts of the students regarding the University of London Union's requirements which they have to meet, Breno expresses his opinion that they can still be successful. As he says, all they have to do is pay sufficient attention to their application. This way, their application will include *nothing more or nothing else* (line 16), so that it will be *right there* (line 17) and *spot on* (line 18), and in other words it will *hit the bull's eye* (line 19). This ENL idiomatic expression *hit the bull's eye*, however, catches Shivani's attention and jokingly she notes that this is fine *as long as it's not an actual bull* (line 21). Breno's

subsequent confirmation request *as long as what?* (line 22) and Halim's clarification request *what do you mean?* (line 23) give her the opportunity to explain what she means. Bulls and cows are sacred in India, the country where she comes from, and thus no one should even imagine harming them (lines 26-28). Continuing with some metalinguistic comments on the expression, Shivani even wonders whether there is any reason due to which this idiomatic expression was created in the first place (lines 38-42), and subsequently for that matter she adds that *it can and it should be changed* (line 58). This is an interesting point, in so far as it shows the speaker's opinion not only about the potentialities of language, as signalled by *it can*, but also the responsibility of language to be free of elements which are culturally contested, as signalled by *it should be changed*.

At hearing all these, and after a pause of 2.5 seconds which is the longest one in this extract (line 59), Halim has the time to think how to respond to the situation. Thus, he takes the decision to refine the previously culturally contested expression into *hit the right target* (line 61) and then *hit in the right way* (line 62). He also works on the idiomatic expression even more, by proposing *do it in the right way* (line 64), and he argues that perhaps this is even better, because it does not contain at all the word *hitting* or any other word which shows any cruelty at all. At this point, Shivani's appraisal of the refined expression is important, as she is the one who expressed her disagreement with the initial Standard English expression. Now, as it is signalled by her *can't agree more with you guys* (line 69) and her *thank you* (line 70), she shows her

agreement with the way that her interlocutors dealt with the ENL expression. This way, as it is argued here, the students were successful in negotiating regarding the initially culturally contested expression by refining its controversial elements and thus turning it into a more culturally acceptable one. It should be noted that, as was the case in the extracts analysed in the previous chapter, there is not any linguistic deficiency of the students here. That is, the students set out to refine these expressions because they considered them as culturally contested and not because these expressions were unfamiliar to them.

6.4. Replacing a culturally contested expression altogether

In the extracts analysed above, the students refine the elements of the expressions which they considered culturally contested. In the two extracts below, the students do not refine only the contested elements on an expression but they replace the entire expression. Hence, the pragmatic sub-function *'replacing a culturally contested expression altogether'*.

6.4.1. 'Too many chiefs and not enough Indians'

(Meaning: 'Too many leaders and not enough people to be led' / Replaced with: 'Not enough positions for everyone', 'not everyone can get what they want' / Participants: Breno - L1 Portuguese, Eshal - L1 Urdu, Jose - L1 Spanish, Leonidas - L1 Greek, Marat - L1 Russian, Shivani - L1 Hindi)

- 22 **Jose** agree
 23 but still my older relatives wouldn't like it for sure hahaha=
 24 **Breno** =because it's not nice to single out any group of people
 25 and say this group of people has been
 26 under another group of people
 27 (2.8)
 28 **Marat** yeah
 29 ok then what can we do about this one?
 30 because i don't know if
 31 if the chiefs were indians who were the leaders of other indians
 32 or some white guys back then
 33 who became the leaders of these indians
 34 so it's like some kind of slavery
 35 which is a big mistake to accept and say
 36 and i can't see what to change from
 37 this like in the previous times
 38 (1.3)
 39 **Eshal** perhaps what about **not enough positions for everyone?**
 40 (4.2)
 41 **Breno** hm it's interesting↑
 42 **Jose** i think this is more culturally and politically correct
 43 and not racist or whatever
 44 but neutral no? (1.1)
 45 yea:::h

Soon after the students start discussing the fact that they all show an interest in a position in their society and no one wishes to remain only a regular member, Marat tries to describe this situation using the expression *too many chiefs and not enough indians* (line 6). This immediately catches Leonidas' attention, who responds to it thus showing his interest and involvement in the conversation, and signals his need for a confirmation request by echoing *and not enough indians* in an interrogative way (line 8). The confirmation of this expression as

well as a lengthy explanation of it comes from Marat, so that Leonidas and everyone else is now sufficiently aware of its meaning. Thus, the students also consider this expression as culturally inappropriate, and Leonidas makes it explicit that they should do something in order for them *to be more politically correct*, as he characteristically says (line 19). Marat, who is the one who used this expression in the first place, agrees with this proposition and sets out to see how they can refine its culturally contested elements, as they did in the extracts analysed in the previous section. However, as he soon explains, *i can't see what to change from this like in the previous times* (line 37). It is at this point that Eshal takes the initiative and replaces the previously contested expression altogether by proposing the expression *not enough positions for everyone* (line 39).

This leads to a relatively long pause of 4.2 seconds (line 40), perhaps due to the fact that the newly proposed expression is not composed of the initial expression with its contested elements refined, as it was the case in the previous extracts, but it is a new expression in its entirety, so the students need more time to appraise it. Still, it seems that this appraisal is a positive one, as it is signalled by Breno's *hm it's interesting* in a rising intonation which shows some enthusiasm (line 41), and Jose's *i think this is more culturally and politically correct* (line 42), followed by the explanation that he said so because *it is not racist* (line 43) but *neutral* (line 39), which is followed by one more *yeah* by him as a further confirmation (line 44). This way, it is argued here that the students negotiated regarding this expression which they initially considered

culturally contested, and they did not refine its culturally contested elements but they replaced it altogether.

Some more light on the pragmatic significance of the students' negotiation regarding this expression is shed below from the comment which Jose made during our interview.

I remember they told me that during our previous meetings, and in this meeting too, and they also told me that later on too, there were some objections. Because one student used an expression, and another student didn't like it... And they all worked, we all worked together and changed some words here and there to make it acceptable in the end... But in this case... we wanted to deal with the problematic expression, but we couldn't change anything, because if we changed something then the sentence wouldn't make any sense... So, yeah, I can see it and remember it here now, it was decided that we should better change all the sentence.

(Jose)

There are two interesting points to discuss here. The first one has to do with the importance which the students had placed on these culturally contested expressions and on their subsequent refinements. As Jose recalls and explicitly mentions, his fellow society members had told him about the incidents regarding the objections to these expressions, even if these incidents had taken place in the meetings which he had not attended. This means that these expressions must have stood out to the students as something which was worth

mentioning to him. The second point relates to the actual process whereby that particular expression was replaced. For that matter, Jose seems to be well aware of the initial difficulty that, as opposed to the cases of the other expressions in the previous extracts, replacing only some contested elements would not be a good choice here. Thus, on that occasion, they decided to negotiate and replace the entire culturally contested expression, and hence the sub-function which I argue that was discerned here, *'replacing a culturally contested expression altogether'*.

6.4.2. 'Merry Christmas'

(Refined as: 'Merry vacations', 'merry holidays', 'have a nice winter break'

/ Participants: Breno - L1 Portuguese, Eshal - L1 Urdu)

In this relatively short dyadic conversation below, it is the last moments of the fifth meeting of the society, a few days before the colleges close for the winter break. Thus, Breno wishes everyone to have a *merry christmas*. This wish is contested by Eshal, who comes from a muslim background, thus the students negotiate and refine it. Here too, it is worth mentioning the initial dilemma as to whether this example should appear in the previous section featuring the pragmatic sub-function *'refining the culturally contested elements of an expression'*, because the students put forward two refinements as it is shown below, or in this section featuring *'replacing a culturally contested expression altogether'*, because there was also an instance of a complete replacement of the expression. In the end, the decision was taken for this example to appear

here, as the two proposed refinements were not appraised positively by the students, whereas the complete replacement of the expression was.

- 1 **Eshal** what else then?
- 2 (1.4)
- 3 **Breno** i don't know (.)
- 4 i think we said everything (.)
- 5 we can say good bye and have a **merry christmas** now=
- 6 **Eshal** =what?
- 7 (1.6)
- 8 **Breno** i said we can say good bye and have a **merry christmas**=
- 9 **Eshal** =i know (2.0)
- 10 i mean (.)
- 11 i don't say have a **merry christmas** (.)
- 12 i'm not christian=
- 13 **Breno** =oo::ps (.) i forgot
- 14 **Eshal** never mind
- 15 (1.3)
- 16 **Breno** have a **merry** what then?
- 17 have a **merry vacations**?
- 18 **Eshal** no:::
- 19 **Breno** have a **merry holidays**?
- 20 **Eshal** no:::
- 21 (2.1)
- 22 **Breno** **have a nice winter break**?
- 23 sounds good=
- 24 **Eshal** =and is good indeed
- 25 **Breno** coo:::l↑
- 26 **Eshal** ha yeah cool haha
- 27 really thanks hahaha

After Breno takes the floor, he tries to wrap up the meeting by wishing everyone a *merry christmas* (line 5). However, this Christian wish, although it is very

common among people in Europe and sometimes it refers to a period in the calendar rather than exclusively to the specific religious and cultural celebration, seems to cause Eshal's reaction due to the fact that she comes from a Muslim background. Thus, she quickly responds and with her interrogative *what* (line 6) she seems to be signalling an initial negative reaction. The pause of 1.6 seconds (line 7) gives some time to Breno to consider what he just said and also what Eshal's interrogative *what* may signal. As he seems to interpret it as some kind of clarification request, he repeats his previous utterance including the *merry christmas* wish once again (line 8). The purpose of Eshal's previous interrogative *what* becomes obvious now, as she quickly responds and this time she makes her proposition clear with her *i know* (line 9), as well as she explains that *i don't say have a merry christmas* (line 11), because *i'm not christian* (line 12). Eshal's explanation seems to make Breno realise Eshal's point, as it becomes obvious from his apologetic *oops* and *i forgot* (line 13). This makes Breno take the floor again and start refining the previous contested wish. For that matter, he first proposes *merry vacations* (line 17) and then *merry holidays* (line 19). In both cases, however, Eshal's prolonged *no* (lines 18 and 20) signals that he does not like Breno's proposals. Thus, Breno, proposes the wish *have a nice winter break* (line 22).

It could be argued that the appropriateness of Breno's last refinement is first appraised positively by him, when he utters *sounds good* (line 23), and then by Eshal herself, when she quickly latches to confirm his utterance with her affirmative *and is good indeed* (line 24). It is also interesting to note that Breno

concludes his thoughts in this dialogue with his *cool* (line 25), and Eshal agrees with him with her similar *yeah cool* among some laughter (line 26). It could be argued that these last exchanges show the collaborative and co-operative negotiation through which Breno and Eshal worked together in order to refine the culturally contested wish *merry christmas*, by means of initially proposing *merry vacations* and *merry holidays*, and eventually deciding that *have a nice winter break* represents a better choice. Last but not least, it could be argued that Eshal's *really thanks* (line 27) shows her appreciation of Breno's understanding and patience thanks to which the whole process of the negotiation and refinement of the culturally contested wish took place. This way, it is argued here, the students achieve the pragmatic sub-function '*replacing a culturally contested expression altogether*'.

At this point, it is interesting to see what the students themselves had to say regarding the culturally contested expressions in the extracts analysed above. For that matter, comments from two students during our post-event interviews are provided below. The first one is Breno, because there were two times that he used an expression which was considered culturally contested, and that was more than anyone else. The second one is Eshal, because, likewise, there were two times that she expressed her objection to the initial ENL expressions and considered them culturally inappropriate, and that is more than anyone else too. It should be noted that these two comments are added at end of this section, although they refer to examples from the previous section too, as it was thought that they could thus offer some kind of a useful overview.

When we talk, we say things that we should not say, not because we do it on purpose but because we don't know everything... *Merry Christmas* is one of the most important wishes for the Christian religion and one of the wishes that you hear most often the days around Christmas, right? And, you know, I just wished everyone *Merry Christmas*, how could I know, I mean, I knew, but how could I imagine what happened afterwards?... And *hitting the bull's eye*, again, very normal expression, and still so much controversy about it... And, yeah, it was because of me that <Eshal> and <Shivani> had every right to say "You're wrong, we feel, like, not angry, but, you know, not happy", do you know what I mean?... That's why we worked together and in the end we made these expressions better.

(Breno)

Part of the role of our society with the international students was to care about everyone. This can't happen if you don't know them and their cultures back home for them... And this means that we should start finding out more about one another first. So, *Merry Christmas* and the other one *bringing home the bacon*, right, look, seriously now, I could have let these things go, but, come on, you don't say these things to a Muslim... And even if a Muslim doesn't tell you explicitly, there will be a thought in the mind, big thought or small thought doesn't matter, but it will be there, about "Oh, hold on, this isn't for me, this should be said in another way"... And, if you don't know or whatever, and an expression like this is used for you, just find another one... But I don't take it personally, after all every time everyone was understanding, so all together were trying, and we were making these expressions neutral, you know.

(Eshal)

It is interesting to highlight one particular issue here. Breno mentions that Eshal and Shivani had every right to complain about the culturally contested expressions which he used, and Eshal mentions that it was useful that these expressions were refined or replaced. It could be said, then, that both these students point to the necessity to negotiate in order to take appropriate action regarding culturally contested expressions, as it was highlighted here with the pragmatic sub-functions *'refining the culturally contested elements of an expression'* and *'replacing a culturally contested expression altogether'*.

6.5. Discussion

This section follows the pattern of the equivalent sections of the previous chapters. It brings together some general points which arise from the analysis of the extracts above after the negotiation regarding the culturally contested expressions looked at here and their subsequent refinement or replacement with more culturally appropriate ones. Subsequently, the pragmatic role of this process is discussed. To begin with, it is worth reiterating the wide range of characteristics of these formulaic expressions. First of all, from a linguistic point of view, these expressions belong to many categories. For instance, Jose's *merry christmas* is a wish (extract 6.4.2), whereas all the rest are idiomatic expressions and in particular metaphors. In addition, it is also shown that some of the contested formulaic expressions referred to religion-related wishes or people or customs, and others referred to historical events with which the

students were familiar. In particular, Leonidas' *all the goods of abraham* refers to a person who is considered important in the Christian religion (extract 6.3.1), and Breno's *merry christmas* is a wish also from the Christian religion (extract 6.3.2). Likewise, some of these expressions are contested because they refer to practices to which the students objected, such as *hit the bull's eye* against which Shivani objected because it was against some of the beliefs of her religion (extract 6.3.3), and *bringing home the bacon* against which Eshal objected because it was against some of the values of her religion too (extract 6.3.4).

One of the contributions of the above findings is that some light is shed on the discourse features of speakers who come from differing linguacultural backgrounds. As discussed above, there has been research regarding various discourse features of intercultural communication which are highlighted as important. For instance, Scollon and Scollon (1995, 2000) and Scollon, Scollon and Jones (2012) look at speakers who come from western and Asian backgrounds. In particular, they examine the rhetorical organisation of their discourse, in corporate and other professional contexts, and one of the features which they highlight is the inductive rhetorical strategy of the westerners as opposed to the deductive one of the Asian speakers. In addition, Cheng (2003) investigates intercultural communication from the perspective of discourse features such as interruptions, overlaps and compliments. On a similar note, Zhu (2014) examines the intercultural communication of speakers' lives at their workplace and business situations such as business negotiations, as well as at

how they go about moments of their lives such as when travelling or studying abroad and they have to appraise humour. In addition to the features of discourse investigated in the above studies from an intercultural perspective, the findings of this chapter have to add various other topics, such as the ones relating to religion and tradition or history, which may be contested in instances of communication between speakers from ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds.

Similarly, it is also interesting to highlight how all these religion- and history-related topics which were initially contested and subsequently refined or replaced, can extensively enrich our understanding regarding negotiation of meaning from the perspective of the referential meaning which is negotiated. As mentioned in the definition provided above, Long (1996) talked of negotiation of meaning as comprising the speakers' provision and interpretation of signals regarding their own or their interlocutors' understanding. This is so, because it was thought that this lack of understanding is potentially perilous for the interaction of the interlocutors. However, the analysis of the extracts here showed that speakers' interaction was at times also jeopardised because of expressions which were culturally contested. Likewise, also noticed in the extracts analysed here were some of the signals such as lack of replies, wrong replies, and requests for help by means of clarification requests and confirmation checks or comprehension checks, which are put forward in negotiation of meaning studies as a means of the speakers to discern cases of lack of understanding. For instance, after Leonidas' *all the goods of abraham*

(extract 6.3.1), Halim's interrogative *who?* and immediately afterwards Breno's repetition of *of abraham?* (extract 6.3.1) could be both interpreted as confirmation checks before the objection to the use of this expression, which subsequently led to its refinement. However, it is shown here that the students' signals sometimes even consisted of explicit statements regarding their proposition. For instance, after Ales' idea that honorary members will be *bringing home the bacon* (extract 6.3.2), Eshal made her point in an explicit way by using *sorry no bringing home the bacon for me please*. Likewise, after Breno's suggestion that they should *hit the bull's eye* (extract 6.3.3), Shivani used *but as long as it's not an actual bull* thus signalling her objection.

Another contribution of this chapter regards negotiation of meaning from the perspective of the language adjustments of the speakers. In his definition, Long (1996) explains that negotiation of meaning has to do with adjustments to linguistic forms, conversational structures, message contents, or all three of them. Although all these are useful and important as interactional processes, it could be argued that the research interest of traditional negotiation of meaning studies remains at reporting the ways that speakers' adjustments conform to the ENL model. It seems, then, although not explicitly mentioned, that interaction is considered from a language deficit perspective. On the contrary, the analysis of the extracts of this chapter show that the students' adjustments exhibit an overwhelming non-conformity to ENL norms and conventions. For instance, the adjustments of the culturally contested expressions which the students were proposing, were leading to expressions which were not part of ENL. In the case

of *all the goods of abraham* (extract 6.3.1), this culturally contested expression was refined as *all the goods of as all the saints* and also as *everything under the sun*. In the same way, *bringing home the bacon* (extract 6.3.2) was contested and refined as *bringing home some other kind of meat*, *bringing home whatever food is allowed* and also *bringing home what we need*.

All this negotiation regarding the initially contested expressions and their subsequent refining or replacement, also point to the need to reconceptualise the nature of these expressions. As discussed above, Swan (2006: 6) uses terms which include “formulaic language”, “formulae” and “idiomatic fixed phrases”, Howarth (1998: 38) talks of “restricted collocations”, and Mel’čuk (1998: 23) talks of “set phrases”. However, as the analysis of the extracts of this chapter show, expressions of this sort are not set or restricted or fixed and formulaic. On the contrary, in all the extracts analysed here, these expressions were found to exhibit heightened adaptations and adjustments in order to suit the communicative objectives of the students in the contexts in which they were used. Needless to say, mastering these so-called formulaic and fixed expressions cannot simply signal ‘mastery’ of Standard English, despite the claims of that matter (Cowie’s 1992, Galperin 2009, Howarth 1998, Wray 2002).

This is so, certainly because Standard English is refuted here as a single model of English which can be identified and aimed at, as it is widely discussed in this study. More importantly, with reference to the findings of this chapter, it could be said that any mastery of such expressions would rather have to do with the

speakers' knowledge of when to use them, when to adapt them and adjust them, how, how much, and so on. In that sense, it could be said that the students in these extracts showed a great deal of knowledge regarding the usage and use of these expressions. This is something which has far reaching pedagogical implications, as it is subsequently shown in the respective chapter with the implications and applications of this study. It could be also added here that the above echo similar ELF-related discussions, for instance, regarding how form follows function (e.g. Cogo 2008) and how pragmatic motives lead to linguistic innovations (e.g. Cogo and Dewey 2006).

What the students found to do here, that is, adapting and adjusting the culturally contested expressions by refining or replacing them, also sheds further light at the idiom principle (Seidlhofer and Widdowson 2007, Seidlhofer 2009b). As discussed above, according to the idiom principle, there can be bottom-up and online construction of idioms outside the ENL idiomatic norms. In the same vein, Pitzl (2009) talks about idiom re-metaphorisation and re-awakening, according to which new metaphors and idioms can be created in a way that does not hinder intelligibility, while at the same time they are pragmatically justified in ELF-mediated contexts. In particular, Pitzl shows that the speakers in her data were achieving the pragmatic functions *'providing emphasis'*, *'increasing explicitness'*, *'elaborating on a point'*, *'talking about abstract concepts'*, *'furthering interpersonal rapport in dealing with tricky situations'*, *'making a sensitive proposition'*, *'adding humour into the discussion'* and *'bringing into the discussion the culture of a particular interlocutor'* (p. 317).

Likewise, as shown in the extracts analysed in this chapter, the students were setting out to refine or replace various elements in expressions which they considered culturally contested or all of them. This way, it was argued here that they were achieving the function '*maintaining cultural appropriateness*' and in particular the sub-functions '*refining the culturally contested elements of an expression*' and '*replacing a culturally contested expression altogether*'. These findings will be taken up again in the chapter which has to do with the pedagogical applications of this study.

6.6. Conclusion

This chapter looks at how the negotiating regarding culturally contested expressions was taking place in the meetings of the international students of this study. In turn, it is shown how the students were thus achieving various pragmatic functions related to attaining or maintaining cultural appropriateness in their meetings. The chapter first discusses the construct of the negotiation of meaning, and it linked it with the characteristic of language to adapt in order to be more suitable regarding the needs of the speakers who use it and the contexts in which it is used. Then, other perspectives on negotiation are also considered, such as negotiation for meaning, and Negotiation with capital D. Subsequently, various studies whose focus is the cultural differences of speakers who come from differing linguistic backgrounds are also discussed. Then, the chapter clarifies that its particular focus is on how students

were revising the expressions which they considered to be culturally contested, by means of idiom variation and re-metaphorisation, and which they were setting out to refine or replace. In so doing, drawing on the analysis of the data in this chapter, it is shown that two pragmatic sub-functions are discerned, *'refining the culturally contested elements of an expression'* and *'replacing a culturally contested expression altogether'*.

CHAPTER 7.

MANAGING THE RELATIONAL AND BUILDING RAPPORT WITH WORD PLAY

7.1. Introduction

This chapter aims at investigating how the international students of this study were managing the relational and how they were establishing rapport in their meetings. In particular, it looks to discern the pragmatic functions which were achieved when they were adapting various idiomatic expressions, either ENL ones or ones which they were translanguaging from their L1s, in order to establish or maintain some sort of adequate social relationships in their interactions. First, there is a brief discussion on the importance of the relational and rapport from the perspective of the social relationships in general. Then, what is shown is how the effort to manage the relational and to establish rapport is an indispensable part of language-mediated interactions too, and in particular what their role is in ELF contexts. This is the backdrop against which what follows is the analysis of the extracts with the expressions which the students were revising for their purposes. Some analytical insights are also drawn from the previous chapters, and in particular the notion of translanguaging and negotiation as well as idiom variation and re-metaphorisation. As it is argued, the students were using word play and were thus achieving the pragmatic function '*managing the relational and establishing rapport*', and in particular the

sub-functions '*making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the in-group of interlocutors*' and '*making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience*'.

7.2. Outlining the relevant concepts and notions

The previous chapters investigate the meetings of the international students who participated in this research study from the perspective of the interplay between their language resources and how they achieved politeness as well as how they ensured cultural appropriateness. This chapter looks at a topic which is closely related with the above, that is, how the students used their language resources in order to manage the relational and in particular how to build rapport. Over the past few years, there has been an increasing interest in the relational and in rapport, due to the realisation of the importance of social interactions, of which the relational and rapport can be seen as indispensable parts. For instance, Enfield (2009: 60) calls social relationships the “primary locus of social organization”. This being the case, it is interesting to shed some light at these two social practices. However, in line with the previous chapters in which it is shown that politeness and cultural appropriateness are not straightforward tasks in ethnolinguistically diverse groups of people, it could be argued that likewise the relational is also not managed and rapport is also not built in a straightforward way. Nevertheless, exactly as in the previous chapters it is shown that achieving politeness and ensuring cultural appropriateness is

nevertheless possible and that the role of language use is crucial for that matter, this chapter shows that a socially sensitive and sensible use of language can also contribute to the way that the relational can be managed through the building of rapport.

Commonsensically, social relationships are associated with what takes place between people who get together and interact with one another. However, there is a variety of thematically interrelated terms for that matter and sometimes their scope overlaps too. Thus, the first consideration here is to clarify what is meant by all these terms in the field, as well as to look at their scope, and then to explain why the 'relational' and 'rapport' were chosen here as well as how they are used in this chapter. Research on interpersonal relationships has been conducted in many areas. For instance, Canney, Davison and Ward (1999) show that good relationship-building is a key ingredient towards the successful management of groups of people. They also highlight the importance of resolving conflicts and disagreements during what they call 'strategic moments' (ibid.). In the same vein, DiStefano and Maznevski (2000) use the notion of 'success' and look at the management of social relationships of group members. In doing so, they classify members of social groups into three performance categories, the 'creators', the 'equalisers' and the 'destroyers' (ibid.), according to how successful they are regarding the building and the sustainment of good social relationships when they participate in various social activities. Finally, Adler (2007) looks at teams of people who get together in order to participate in large scale transnational and cross-sectoral projects. In

particular, what she acknowledges is that the management of such teams is a challenging task, but the affective management of interpersonal relationships constitute an important component in the participants' efforts to deal with it successfully.

With reference to interpersonal relationships research from a discursive point of view, Locher (2004, 2010), Locher and Watts (2005, 2008) and Watts (2008) put forward the term 'relational work'. As they explain, relational work refers to "all aspects of the work invested by individuals in the construction, maintenance, and reproduction of interpersonal relationships among those engaged in social practice" (Locher and Watts 2008: 96). In the workplace and the other contexts which they look at, Locher and Watts maintain that interactants have certain normative expectations. When their fellow interactants' actions conform to them, they are perceived as unmarked and go unnoticed or at least unproblematised. When they breach these normative expectations, they are perceived as marked and they are noticed (Locher and Watts 2005). A similar term is 'relational practice', which Fletcher (1999: 84) defines as "a way of working that reflects a relational logic of effectiveness and requires a number of relational skills such as empathy, mutuality, reciprocity, and a sensitivity to emotional contexts". This term has come to be taken up mainly with reference to workplaces. For instance, Holmes and Marra (2004) and Holmes and Schnurr (2005) set out to investigate relational practices in business contexts, and they find that they contribute to the advancement of the primary objectives of the workplace by means of addressing the face needs of the people involved.

In particular, they find that small talk, positive humour, and off-record approvals are some of the discursive features which help maintain a sound atmosphere in the workplace.

Finally, Arundale (2006, 2010) takes a pragmatics perspective, and uses the term 'relational'. To explain how he outlines the relational, he makes it clear that he takes into consideration Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson's (1967) distinction between the aspects of communication which have to do with relationships as opposed to content. He also clarifies that he takes into consideration Halliday's (1978) distinction between the interpersonal and the ideational meaning.

Likewise, he also considers the distinction between the relational or interactional use of language and its informational or transactional use (cf. Brown and Yule 1983). However, as he concludes, he opts for Austin's (1962) argument that a central function of language use is to perform actions. Thus, with reference to the scope of the relational, he explains that he sees it as indexing "the dynamic phenomena of relating as they emerge dynamically in person-to-person communication" (2006: 202). In addition, Arundale (2010) draws on Baxter and Montgomery (1996), and he argues that human relationships are construed by three dialectics, connectedness/separateness, openness/closedness and certainty/uncertainty. Thus, following-up on the dialectic of connectedness/separateness, he further elaborates that he views the relational as "connectedness and separateness, conjointly co-constituted in talk/conduct in interaction" (p. 2078).

One of the advantages of the scope of this term is that it is easier to identify it in the discourse, compared to relational practice and relational work. For instance, as it is mentioned above, relational practice includes generic types of behaviour, such as empathy, mutuality and reciprocity, and relational work has to do with off-record approval and small talk in order to achieve good interpersonal relationships. However, as this research study relates to language use and its role in interactions, it is closer to the scope of the term 'relational', and that this why this term is used here. In addition, the term 'relational' is used in this chapter, as it is closer to what is noticed that the students were doing as well. That is, Arundale's point about participants' efforts to relate to others in their interactions, were noticed in the students' conversations which are analysed below, as it is shown. In addition to this effort, Arundale makes the point that achieving a connection with others is not an easy task, and likewise it was also noticed here that the students were using their linguistic resources in a very strategic way in order to achieve some kind of connection with their fellow interlocutors.

Thus understood, the relational could be seen as an overarching category, and a variety of closely interrelated practices can be associated with it or even be seen as manifestations of it. For instance, with reference to the relationship building which is mentioned above, and in particular with reference to the affective quality of relationships, a certain body of research has focussed on rapport. The discussions of rapport started relatively early, and rapport was associated with phatic communication, and thus it was thought to complement

the transactional communication of language (cf. Brown and Yule 1983). As early as 1923, Malinowski outlines phatic communication as “the use of language in pure social interaction [in which] the referential function... subordinates to its social and emotive function” (p. 312-313). Building on this work, Jakobson (1990 [1960]: 75) describes the phatic function of language as referring to “messages primarily serving to establish, prolong, or to discontinue communication..., to attract the attention of the interlocutor or to confirm his continued attention”. In a similar vein, Halliday (1975, 1978) talks of the interactional function of language as a way of speakers to use language in order to make contact with others and establish or maintain relationships. However, thus taken, the phatic communication and the ensuing interactional function of language is nothing but an inferior counterpart of the transactional function of language, which has to do with the provision of information or the expression of meaning or thought (cf. Brown and Yule 1983 for a review of this dichotomy, and Coupland 2000 for more on the critique of this take). Since then, the phatic function of language has been re-evaluated, and now the interactional and the transactional functions of language are rather considered as complementary (see e.g. Laver 1975 and Knapp 1978 for a general discussion, and Leung 2005 for a more recent discussion on convivial communication from a Hymesian communicative competence perspective).

Rapport has also been researched from a pragmatics perspective. In her research on what a comprehensive account of human communication could comprise, Lakoff (1973) puts forward two strategies. The first one is the strategy

of clarity. This is subsequently captured by Grice's (1975) *Co-operative Principle* and its constituent maxims, as a blueprint of what he saw as rational language use. The second one is the strategy of rapport. These two strategies seem to be reminiscent of the referential and the interpersonal function or use of language, which have been discussed by many different language philosophers and linguists (cf. Brown and Yule 1983). On the basis of these two strategies, Lakoff proposes two rules of pragmatic competence, *Be clear* and *Be Polite* (1973: 296). The rule *Be Polite* is further broken down into three rules of rapport, *Don't Impose (Distance)*, *Give Options (Deference)* and *Be Friendly (Camaraderie)*. These three rules of rapport were also referred to as 'rules of politeness' (1990: 35) (and also see Chapter 2 for more on Lakoff's rules and maxims and their contribution to politeness research).

Lakoff's (1973) rules of rapport are also considered by Tannen's (1984b), in her study aiming at identifying and characterising various conversational styles according to the type of rapport which they create, and in particular the language devices which the speakers use for that matter. In doing so, Tannen provides an account of a number of stylistic devices which can indicate strategies to create rapport. The features which Tannen identifies include topic choice, narrative strategies, pacing, and paralinguistic features such as voice quality and pitch. For instance, narrative strategies include 'Tell more stories', 'Tell stories in rounds' and 'Prefer internal evaluation' (pp. 30-31). Tannen suggests that these features are characteristics of what she names 'high involvement style' (p. 31). Tannen's investigation of different interactive styles is

useful regarding highlighting the necessity to focus on conversational behaviour. This is so, because the acknowledgement of different conversational styles points to the need to shift the attention from individual speakers who speak in a particular way and instead to set out to investigate pairs or groups of people who co-operate and collaborate thus bringing about a certain conversational style. The analysis of the extracts of the previous three analytical chapters yield a variety of interaction-related features such as sentence completions and overlappings or latches, and it was argued that they signalled the students' co-operation and collaboration in a way that contributed to the large number of their linguistic innovations and their pragmatic significance. Likewise, it is shown below that the pragmatic sub-functions which are identified in the extracts of this chapter are closely related to the high involvement style in Tannen's work on rapport.

In a similar vein, rapport is researched by Spencer-Oatey and Franklin (e.g. Spencer-Oatey 2002, 2009; Spenser-Oatey and Franklin 2009). In their view (Spenser-Oatey and Franklin 2009: 102), 'rapport' has to do with the "people's subjective perceptions of (dis)harmony, smoothness-turbulence and warmth-antagonism in interpersonal relations". Thus, they use the term 'rapport management' (ibid.) to refer to the way that the above can be managed. Spencer-Oatey (2002) also explores the nature of what she calls 'rapport-sensitive' incidents, which she defines as "incidents involving social interactions that [interactants] found to be particular noticeable in some way, in terms of their relationship with the other person" (p. 534). This noticeable impact could

be positive or negative too. The notion of rapport sensitive incidents is also crucial in the analysis of the extracts below, as it is exactly them which allowed the identification of the pragmatic function and sub-functions, as it is shown.

An interesting aspect of the rapport-related work of Spencer-Oatey (2002) is that she also emphasises the need for the development of an analytical framework which can sufficiently allow the investigation of interactants' reactions from a rapport perspective. For that matter, she highlights the need the gain access to the perceptions of the interactants themselves, and in particular she focuses on the interactants' assessments of the affective quality which they dynamically experience and develop with one another during their interactions. Going into more details regarding what such an analytical framework could include, she maintains that discourse data need to be complemented with comments which the interactants themselves can provide during post-event interviews. It is worth reiterating here that the analytical and methodological considerations of this research study tally with Spencer-Oatey's points. As it is been extensively shown in the analytical chapters of this research study, the naturally occurring spoken discourse obtained from the students' meetings is complemented with the metalinguistic comments which the students themselves provided during our post-event interviews.

From a rapport perspective, which is the topic here, such a complementarity is also reported in research studies which look at classroom discourse. For instance, Nguyen (2007: 286) defines rapport as "a positive social relationship

characterised by mutual trust and emotional affinity”, and uses the term ‘rapport building’ to refer to what takes place when the above are achieved. In particular, he focuses on educational settings, and specifically he looks at interactions between teachers and students. What he finds in his study is that the teachers used rapport building in a strategic way so as to facilitate instructional activities. In other words, he finds that that the students performed better during activities which aimed at their learning, when the teachers supplemented the instructional part of the activities with some rapport building. He thus concludes that “a balance needs to be reached between rapport and instructional tasks” (p. 284).

Also, Ädel (2010) investigates rapport from the perspective of identification of functional categories which can be thought of as what takes place when interlocutors build rapport. Ädel’s point of departure is the examination of bonding and in particular what it comprises and how it is achieved. Her research shows that bonding is the manifestation of one of the basic human needs, that is, human’s need to come closer to and maintain positive relationships with others in the social groups to which they belong. This bonding is achieved through what she calls ‘rapport building’ (ibid.). In particular, Ädel (2010) sets out to observe the rapport building practices during face-to-face interactions of campus-based university students and others who study online. What she identifies in her data is that rapport building is achieved through four types of units which in turn comprise a set of various functional categories. The type of unit ‘*Discourse-structuring*’ comprised the functions ‘*Greeting*’, ‘*Closing*’ and ‘*Excusing oneself*’. The type of unit ‘*Inter-textual*’ comprised the function

'Referring to in-group discourse'. The *'Face-saving'* type of unity comprised *'Apologising'* and *'Mitigating criticism'*. And *'Bonding'* comprised *'Agreeing'*, *'Aligning with in-group'*, *'Commiserating'*, *'Complimenting'*, *'Seeking agreement'*, *'Offering encouragement'*, *'Phatic communication'*, *'Seeking agreement'*, *'Thanking'*, *'Responding to thanks'*, and *'Chatting'* (pp. 2939 and 2942). This taxonomy is of paramount importance for this chapter, as the aim here is also to investigate the language practices of the students in order to discern the functions which they achieved and which contributed to the building of rapport in their interactions.

Managing the relational and building rapport are important to the majority of language-mediated interactions, as it is shown in the studies above. However, these studies examine interactions from participants who come from the same linguistic and cultural background. Fewer studies investigate the relational and rapport in ELF interactions of speakers who come from differing linguacultural background. In one of these studies, Cogo (2007) finds that speakers often set out to express solidarity by drawing a lexical item from their interlocutors' linguistic background, and Kordon (2006) finds that this way interlocutors can build rapport. In the same vein, Pullin (2009, 2010) notes how small talk and humour can respectively contribute to solidarity and rapport among participants in business meetings. Pullin (2011, 2013), again looking at business meetings, also discusses how ELF participants achieve what she calls 'comity' through their linguistic stance. Ehrenreich (2008) finds that elements from the three characteristics of a community of practice, ie. mutual engagement, join

enterprise and shared repertoire (cf. Wenger 1998), were also discerned in the ELF-mediated business settings which she investigated. Also in a community practice framework, Kaloscai (2011) focuses on how the Erasmus students of her study achieved solidarity and casualness as a means to go about their interpersonal relationships. Last but not least, Pennarola (2013) looks at how migrants from differing linguacultural backgrounds built a sense of community through careful communication management on the online forums in which they participate.

Needless to say, the investigation of how the relational is managed and how rapport is built in ELF-mediated interactions is still an under-researched area. Thus, this chapter aims at shedding more light at this field. In particular, as mentioned above, this chapter looks at how the international students who participated in this research study were managing the relational and building their rapport in their meetings by adapting various expressions according to their own or their interlocutors' sociocultural background. What is shown is that they were doing so, not in order to achieve politeness, as it is discussed in Chapter 5, or in order to ensure cultural appropriateness, as it is discussed in Chapter 6. Instead, what is shown here is that the students were adapting the initially used expressions which they considered not sufficiently 'relevant' to their interlocutors in the group. Thus, they were adapting them so that they could now 'include' them as well, as it were. The concept of 'inclusivity' could be thus connected to the way that the concept of 'belongingness' can be found in intercultural research, for instance in relation to 'territoriality' (Holliday, Hyde and

Kullman 2012) or in problematisations of cultures being linked only to 'national territories' (Lavanchy, Gajardo and Dervin 2011).

It should also be noted here that the expressions which the students were adapting were idiomatic expressions, which belong to the category of the so-called formulaic expressions, as it is discussed in the previous chapter. Thus, some considerations are drawn from the previous chapter, and in particular Seidlhofer and Widdosown's (2007) 'open choice principle' and Pitzl's (2009, 2012) notion of idiom variation and re-metaphorisation, are key concepts in the analysis below too. This way, this chapter aims at providing some more support to the findings which are discussed in the previous chapter, that is, that the so-called idiomatic formulaic expressions are far from formulaic, in so far as they can adjust and adapt according to the needs of the speakers who use them and in particular according to the functions which these speakers aim at achieving. In these extracts below, the overarching function which was identified is *'managing the relational and building rapport'*. The function is further broken down into the sub-functions *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the in-group of the interlocutors'* and *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience'*, which are illustrated with the help of six extracts.

Last but not least, a note has to be made regarding the adaptation of the initially used idiomatic expressions and how they related to humorous language play. In the extracts of the previous chapters, various innovative phrases and expressions emerged in order to suit the communicative objectives of the

students who used them and the specific contexts in which they were used. In a sense, this is the case in this extract too. However, here, the students set out to adapt the initially used idiomatic expressions in a way which is characterised by elements of humour and playfulness. Vega (1990) goes as far as to propose to view humour as the fifth element of communicative competence. In a similar vein, Cook (1997: 227) defines language play and in particular word play as a “behaviour not primarily motivated by human need to manipulate the environment (and to share information for this purpose) and to form and maintain social relationships”, but he also adds that “[word play] may indirectly serve both of these functions” (ibid.). Likewise, the importance of humour and playfulness is also shown here, and in particular light is shed on the respective instances from the perspective of how they contributed to the pragmatic functions and sub-functions of this chapter.

7.3. Making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group

As mentioned above, the first pragmatic function which was achieved when the students were adapting an idiomatic expression in order to manage the relationship and build rapport with their fellow interlocutors was *‘making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group’*. This pragmatic function is illustrated below through the analysis of four extracts.

7.3.1. 'I was bringing the soy sauce'

(Mandarin Chinese hanzi: '打酱油'; pinyin: 'da jiang you' / Meaning: 'I was helping only with minor tasks' / Revised as: 'I was bringing the tea bags', 'I was bringing the beer bottles', 'I will bring the naan bread', 'I'll go bring the papayas and the guavas fruits' / Participants: Breno - L1 Portuguese, Eshal - L1 Urdu, Linlin - L1 Mandarin Chinese, Winnie - L1 Cantonese Chinese)

In this extract, taken from the second meeting, the students discuss their backgrounds so that they can decide who is more suitable for each position. Linlin recalls a similar post which she held when she was volunteering at her school, and she uses a direct translation of the Mandarin Chinese idiomatic expression as *i was bringing the soy sauce*, meaning that she was helping only with minor tasks back then, as she informed me in our post-event interview.

- 1 **Linlin** not exactly experience (.)
- 2 but when i was in my country in my school
- 3 i was representing my school to some common events (.)
- 4 events you know with other schools in the same region
- 5 **Breno** so so what did you do then
- 6 what [is this]
- 7 **Eshal** [yeah what]=
- 8 **Linlin** =ahhh different students were doing different things
- 9 i didn't have any particular position
- 10 i had i was taking the place of other
- 11 you know if they couldn't go to a meeting
- 12 **Eshal** so::: you were sub representing substituting them
- 13 **Linlin** yeah that's right (.)

- 14 it was nice for me and useful for everyone (.)
- 15 but to tell you the truth it was quite peripheral
- 16 **i i (1.3) i was bringing the soy sauce** haha
- 17 as we say in chinese again haha
- 18 **Breno** hahaha and what's this this time?
- 19 **Linlin** haha i know haha
- 20 ah you know when a lot of people are doing something
- 21 and you don't have anything to do
- 22 but you want to do something
- 23 like in cooking mother cooks and you want to help
- 24 so they can tell go bring the soy sauce
- 25 like do something small you know just do something=
- 26 **Breno** =[haha]ha
- 27 **Eshal** =[haha]
- 28 **Breno** but why soy sauce? i mean=
- 29 **Linlin** =oh because soy in chinese cuisine we use soy sauce a lot
- 30 **Eshal** ah
- 31 (1.3)
- 32 **Linlin** i mean ok for england because we are here in england
- 33 and the british people drink tea a lot hahaha
- 34 i should tell hahaha **I was bringing the tea bags** hahaha
- 35 **Eshal** haha[haha]
- 36 **Breno** [haha]haha (1.3)
- 37 nu::h they we don't drink tea but drink beer here now
- 38 you should better tell haha
- 39 you should tell **i was bringing the beer bottles**
- 40 **Linlin** [hahaha]
- 41 **Eshal** [hahaha]
- 42 but we? but i don't drink alcohol i'm muslim hahaha (.)
- 43 haha ok for me the language should change (1.7)
- 44 hey can i tell i will bring i don't know
- 45 **i will bring the naan bread** or something hahaha
- 46 **Linlin** haha[ha]
- 47 **Breno** [ha]ha
- 48 and i'll go bring the papayas and the guavas fruits

- 49 **Eshal** yeah and we'll have an international dinner
 50 full of international tastes and colours haha=
 51 **Linlin** =guys doesn't this remind you of the of our meeting? (.)
 52 english full of international words and phrases
 53 **Breno** yummy haha yes such English is good [why not]
 54 **Eshal** [yes↑ ha]hahaha
 55 **Winnie** count me in as well↑

As Linlin explains about the expression *i was bringing the soy sauce* (lines 20-25), when there is a collective effort towards the achievement of a common objective but an individual's contribution is of minor importance, this resembles the situation when an elder member of a family prepares a meal and asks a younger member to do something even if this something is rather trivial, say, to go bring the soy sauce. And, as she adds, *soy sauce* is used in the expression because *in chinese cuisine we use soy sauce a lot* (line 29). It is at this point that *i was bringing the say sauce* sparks a negotiation of how it should be best used in order to be more relevant to the sociocultural background of the interlocutors in that meeting. As mentioned above, the rationale behind *soy sauce* in this expression in Mandarin Chinese is its widespread use in Chinese cuisine. These international students consider this idiomatic expression successful enough and they welcome it in their discussion, but they also set out to experiment and to propose alternative expressions, taking into consideration the dietary choices and the cuisines of their countries too.

Thus, they start from the country in which they live now, and Linlin comes up with *i was bringing the tea bags*, which she justifies on the basis of the fact that they are now *in england* and *the british people drink tea a lot* (lines 32-34).

Eshal's and then Breno's short laugh (lines 35 and 36) signal that they welcome the way that Linlin's adapted the idiomatic expression. Breno then takes the opportunity to propose *i was bringing the beer bottles*, because in England nowadays what is preferred is not tea but beer, as he argues (lines 37-39). Again, Linlin's and Eshal's laughter reveal their positive appraisal of Breno's idea (lines 40 and 41). However, Eshal feels that the beer-related expression is not suitable for her, because she is Muslim and she is not supposed to drink alcohol, as she explains (line 42). For that reason, she argues that there should be another idiomatic expression for her, and she proposes *i will bring the naan bread* considering her Pakistani background in which naan bread is a very widely used kind of flat bread (lines 43-45). Once again, Linlin's and Breno's laughter (lines 46 and 47) indicate that they welcome Eshal's idiomatic expression. It is then that Breno proposes *i'll go bring the papayas and the guavas fruits* (line 48), since these two kinds of fruits are among the most characteristic ones in his home country, Brazil. Thus, as it is argued here, the students related to their interlocutors by adapting the initial idiomatic expression to include them too, and in particular they did that in way which helped them achieve the pragmatic function '*making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group*'.

The final exchanges of this extract do not include any more adaptations. They are however important, because they are illustrative of the overall openness of these interactants both regarding the practice of drawing linguistic elements from their mother tongues and using them in their conversations, and also

regarding the ways that they see it necessary to adapt them in order to suit their sociocultural backgrounds. After mentioning all these international foods and drinks, the *soy sauce*, the *tea*, the *beer*, the *naan bread* and the *papayas and guavas*, Eshal playfully says that they should organise an *international dinner*, which would be full of *international tastes and colours* (line 49). Very cleverly, Linlin builds on that by adding that such a dinner would resemble the English language of their meeting, which is also *full of international words and phrases* (lines 51-52). Breno's *yummy* expresses his approval of such a dinner (line 53), and in the same way his *yes such English is good why not* (line 53) also shows his approval of the English which they are all aware that they use and which at times varies from the Standard English.

Closely related to the pragmatic function '*making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group*' were the metalinguistic comments which Linlin and Winnie provided in our post-event interviews. I chose to interview Linlin for that matter, as she was the one who had used the expression which was subsequently adapted multiple times by her and by her fellow interlocutors, as well as she had adapted some expressions herself in the other extracts looked at here. I also chose to provide Winnie's comments below, as they were revealing regarding the overarching function '*managing the relational and building rapport*'.

When I use a language, my mother tongue Mandarin Chinese, or English, it's the same thing, I try to use them to do something... And, yeah, it was very interesting in these meetings, how the language can become yours... I mean, *i was bringing*

the soy sauce is from Mandarin Chinese, so it was mine anyway, but it was interesting how the other guys started changing it and making it theirs too, talking about foods and fruits from their countries... So, you know, I think, this way, the language relates to you, and you relate to others.

(Linlin)

My opinion about what we did in these meetings has to do with something I consider very important... Of course, we used these phrasings because we were talking, because we had to tell our thoughts to the rest in these meeting... But in this particular case, hmmm, interesting, my opinion is that we also wanted to create this feeling when you're close with others and when you're comfortable with them and everything goes well, ra, ra, eeerm, rapport.

(Winnie)

For Linlin, the way speakers use language is already something personal, but adapting an expression so that it can include specific aspects of their own cultural background is a way to personalise it even more. According to Linlin, this is useful, in so far as it changes both the way one sees such an expression, but also the way one use such an expression thereafter. In particular, as Linlin mentions, “*this way, the language relates to you, and you relate to others*”.

From a methodological point of view, Linlin's metalinguistic comments were useful in my effort to discern and name the sub-function achieved here, ‘*making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group*’. In addition, Winnie's comments about “*this feeling when you are close with others and when you're comfortable with them and everything goes well*” and “*rapport*”, led

to finally discerning and naming the overarching function '*managing the relational and building rapport*'. It should be noted that, this way, the students did not aim at achieving politeness or being culturally appropriate, in so far they had not used any expression which was impolite or culturally contested, as it was the case in the extracts analysed in Chapter 5 and 6, respectively. The same applies to the rest of the extracts of this chapter, and this distinction will also be further highlighted in the discussion below.

7.3.2. 'I've crossed the Rubicon River'

(Meaning: 'I've taken the irrevocable decision to do something, although I know that it entails difficulties' / Revised as: 'I've crossed the Moskva River', 'I've crossed the Amazon River', 'I've crossed the Yangtze River', 'I've crossed the Thames' / Participants: Arvin - Mauritius Creole, Donatella - L1 Italian, Jose - L1 Spanish, Linlin - Mandarin Chinese, Marat - L1 Russian)

The example looked at below is from the third meeting of the society. Donatella, who comes from Italy, tries to persuade the other members of the society that she has taken the decision to be involved in their society, and for that matter she uses the ENL idiomatic expression *i've crossed the Rubicon river*. The expression means to take the irrevocable decision to do something, although it entails difficulties. It owes its existence to Julius Ceasar and his army when they crossed the Rubicon River and started heading towards Rome in 49 BC as an act of insurrection against Pompey. After the meaning of this idiomatic

- 30 [hahaha]
- 31 Arvin [hahaha]ha
- 32 Jose [true that]
- 33 or or **i've crossed the amazon river** we have in south america=
- 34 Marat =yeah but what's so special about your river?
- 35 hahaha like it's not as cold as [ours right why is it difficult?]
- 36 Breno [but it has crocodiles [man]
- 37 Arvin [haha]hahaha
- 38 Breno like that's real danger man (.) your cold river is nothing
- 39 Marat haha yeah ok point taken
- 40 (1.6)
- 41 Linlin and and guys i guess you know it
- 42 we have yangtze river in china
- 43 so you could say **i've crossed the yangtze river** too (.)
- 44 Donatella sure you could why not
- 45 Linlin no not me it's impossible
- 46 not cold and no crocodiles [i can a]ssure you hahahaha
- 47 Donatella [hahaha]
- 48 Linlin but it's rea:::lly long and wide guys
- 49 it needs to be really determined to go cross it if you can
- 50 (2.2)
- 51 Arvin yeah (.)
- 52 and and
- 53 and since we're here in London=
- 54 Donatella =thames?=
55 Arvin =yeap
56 like you know you can say **i've crossed the thames**
- 57 Linlin of course you can
- 58 (.)
- 59 Donatella yeah but the thames is like easy to cross no?=
60 Arvin =but it's polluted [very much the]se days <Donatella> hahahaha
61 Donatella [hahahahaha]
62 Arvin so this is another kind of difficulty
63 Donatella haha yeah i agree with you
64 Arvin so anyone else any other river? hahaha

Arvin, takes the floor, as he asks Donatella regarding her decision to accept the position which they offered her in their society (lines 1 and 3), with which Donatella has agreed (lines 2 and 4). Although she acknowledges that this position is demanding and she is already busy with her course and her job (lines 5-7), she confirms that she decided to accept it (lines 9 and 10). In particular, in order to emphasise the fact that she accepted it but she is well aware of the ensuing difficulties, she uses the ENL idiomatic expression *i've crossed the rubicon river* (line 11). This immediately elicits Arvin and Jose's clarification requests, first with the interrogative pronoun *what?* (line 12) and then with the echoing of *rubicon river?* (line 13). Donatella provides some background historical information about this expression (line 17-20), explaining that this expression exists in the English language too (line 22), and likewise Marat adds that it also exists in Russian as well (line 23). It is at this point that Marat initiates a series of adaptations, in order to change the Italy-related idiomatic expression *i've crossed the rubicon river* into an expression which makes more sense for them and their countries. In addition, it is interesting to note that the students, wanting to share more information about their country's river, they also provide some more details to explain the difficulties involved in such a hypothetical decision.

Thus, as Marat notes, *we should better say i've crossed the moskva river* (line 25), as Moscow also has a river called Moskva, and in particular it is a more difficult decision to cross this river than Rubicon, as the outside temperature in Moscow may be even -40 °C, as he explains (lines 28). Arvin's approving

repetitive laughter (line 30) and Jose's *true that* (line 30) signal their acceptance of Marat's adaptation as well as the information about it. Likewise, Jose continues with an adaptation based on his region in South America and the most famous river there, the Amazon, and proposes *i've crossed the amazon river* (line 33). This is also something difficult to do, not because of the outside cold as in the case of Moscow but because of the crocodiles in the Amazon, as Jose explains (line 36). Marat's *yeah ok point taken* (line 37) signals his approval of Jose's adaptation too. At this point, it is Linlin who takes the floor and proposes *i've crossed the yangtze river* (line 43), which is not cold and it does not have crocodiles either but it is nevertheless difficult to cross because it is too long and wide, as she explains (lines 48-49). Again, Arvin's *yeah* (line 51) is an approval of Linlin's proposal and justification of it too. Finally, since at this point all the society members live in London, Arvin also proposes the adaptation *i've crossed the thames* (line 56), with Thames' difficulty being that it is too polluted, as Arvin explains (line 60). Thus, as it is shown here, the students were adapting the initially used idiomatic expression in a way that could reveal their effort to make it more relevant to them according to their backgrounds. In addition, with all these proposals and their explanations, they furthered the convivial atmosphere of their meeting. Thus, it is argued here that they achieved the pragmatic sub-function '*making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group*' as well as the overarching function '*managing the relational and building rapport*'.

7.3.3. 'Himalayan blunder'

(Actual meaning: 'Very big mistake' / Revised as: 'Blunder as high as Mound Tai', 'blunder from the Highlands' / Participants: Linlin - Mandarin Chinese, Marat - L1 Russian, Sener - L1 Turkish, Shivani - L1 Hindi)

This extract is from the second meeting of the society. As is the case in the previous one, the idiomatic expression looked at here also has to do with landmarks. At this particular point, on the grounds that their society is an international student society, the students agree that it would be a big mistake to decide to enrol students who do not come from abroad. Shivani, in particular, feels very strongly for that matter, and she uses the idiomatic expression *himalayan blunder* to describe how big she believes that this mistake would be. From information which I gathered online about this expression, as well as from what Shivani herself mentioned during our post-event interview, it seems that this idiomatic expression was initially linked to a defeat of the Indian army near the mountain range of the Himalayas in the 1960's. Thus, it was originally used to denote a big failure in the context of Indian politics. However, this meaning gradually faded, and the expression is nowadays used to denote any big mistake of any country or person in any context or field, due to the height of the Himalayas mountain range. This is how it is used in this extract too. The idiomatic expression is well received from Shivani's interlocutors, but all of them set out to adapt it to convey the same meaning using name of mountains from other countries.

- 1 **Shivani** don't get me wrong i don't mind
 2 and i don't have any problem with other classmates and others (.)
 3 but we're a society with international students right? (.)
 4 so our members will want to come and meet others like them=
 5 **Linlin** =yeah that's true
 6 **Shivani** and also we'll be talking about visa applications
 7 cheap tickets back home
 8 storing your stuff o[ver the] summer
 9 **Linlin** [agree]
 10 **Shivani** so if we accept everyone
 11 in the short term ok we'll get more members
 12 but (.) little by little our international students will start leaving us
 13 because they won't like our society as much as=
 14 **Marat** =as before (.)
 15 and this this would not be good
 16 **Sener** i also agree with you guys
 17 **Shivani** it would be a big mistake a blunder
 18 a **himalayan blunder** act[ually]
 19 **Sener** [him] **himalayan blunder**?
 20 **Shivani** yeah haha we say that in india
 21 especially the closer you get north
 22 in the northern part of india near the himalayas (.)
 23 'cause the himalayas are so high
 24 so you know high mountain, big mistake
 25 **himalayan blu[nder then]**
 26 **Marat** [yeah nice]
 27 very vivid image
 28 (2.3)
 29 **Linlin** and i guess it could be haha
 30 in my case in my country
 31 a **blunder as high as mount tai**
 32 **tai shan**
 33 **mount tai** is very big and high obviously
 34 so it makes sense to say this (.)
 35 and also it's one of our cultural and natural world heritage sites=

- 36 Sener =[oh coo:::l↑]
 37 Shivani [impress]live↑
 38 (2.1)
 39 Sener or we could say could we say?
 40 haha a **blunder from the highlands?**
 41 in scotland?
 42 since we are in the uk now?
 43 so more useful now than himalayan and tai
 44 Shivani i see what you mean=
 45 Marat =but the highlands are not famous for being high
 46 they're famous for whiskey [from the high]lands and scotland
 47 Sener [hahahahaha]
 48 Marat for nothing else
 49 Sener yeah=
 50 Shivani =but hahaha
 51 whiskey from the highlands
 52 or any alcoholic drink from any place in the world
 53 can can cause a lot of big mistakes
 54 regarding your health and your behaviour too so
 55 Marat hahahahaha yeah so there is a point in
 56 in **blunder from the highlands** too
 57 Shivani it seems so
 58 (1.3)
 59 Linlin so **himalayan blunder**
 60 **blunder as high as mount tai**
 61 **and blunder from the highlands**
 62 Sener and hopefully no blunder from our society right?
 63 Linlin we'll be careful hahahaha

The extract opens with Shivani elaborating on her belief that allowing non-international students to join their society would be such a big mistake that she uses the idiomatic expression *himalayan blunder* to describe it (line 18). A positive appraisal of Shivani's idiomatic expression comes when Marat

comments favourably on it with his *yeah nice* (line 26), followed by his exclamatory *very vivid image* in an enthusiastic rising intonation (line 27). The floor is then taken by Linlin and she shares with her interlocutors her thought that the idiomatic expression *himalayan blunder* could as well be adapted into *blunder as high as mount tai* (line 31). She first shifts into Mandarin Chinese and provides the name of mountain, *tai shan* (line 32), and then she explains that *mount tai is very big and high* (line 33), and so *it makes sense to say this* (line 34). She also adds that Mount Tai is also one of the *cultural and natural world heritage sites* (lines 35), which elicits the latching and overlapping positive comment *oh cool* from Sener (line 36) and *impressive* from Shivani (line 37).

In this collaborative and co-operative context, Sener continues their discussion, proposing that they could also use the expression *blunder from the highlands* (line 40), *since we are in the uk now* (line 42). Again, the positive comment on this expression as well, this time Shivani's *i see what you mean* (line 44), could be taken as a welcoming appraisal of this adaptation too. One more positive comment also comes from Marat, with his enthusiastic laughter followed by his *so there is a point in blunder from the highlands* (line 56). This episode closes with Linlin repeating the initial idiomatic expression *himalayan blunder* as well as the newly emerged *blunder as high as mount tai* and *blunder from the highlands* (lines 59-61), and with Sener and Linlin agreeing that there should not be any blunder from their society at least (lines 62-63). Thus, the adaptation of the initial expression *himalayan blunder* as *blunder as high as mount tai* and *blunder from the highlands*, with the positive appraisals which the resulted

expressions were receiving each time, and the overall subsequent camaraderie in this supportive environment, could be argued to be one more example of the students' effort to further their bonding and their interpersonal relationships. In particular, this was achieved through the pragmatic function *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group'*.

7.3.4. 'From Guatemala to Guatepeor'

**(Literal meaning: 'You left Guate-bad and you ended up to Guate-worse';
Metaphorical meaning: 'From the frying pan into the fire'; Actual meaning:
'From bad to worse' / Revised as: 'Lond-on and Lond-off', 'Par-is and Par-is-not', 'Berl-in and Berl-out', 'I-am-sterdam and 'I-am-not-sterdam' /
Participants: Elvira - L1 Spanish, Linlin - Mandarin Chinese, Marat - L1 Russian, Sener - L1 Turkish, Shivani - L1 Hindi)**

In the extract below, the focus is on an idiomatic expression from Spanish, the mother tongue of Elvira, one of the students who came from Spain. At this particular point, taken from the first meeting of the society, the students are lamenting the litter which the student clubs and societies leave behind after the freshers' fayres, and they promise to be careful for that matter. Elvira, then, uses the expression *from guatemala to guatepeor*. She explains that this is a Spanish expression, which she just translated into English, and that it has to do with a wordplay, since in Spanish *mala* means *bad* and *peor* means *worse*. Her fellow interlocutors welcome this expression, and try to adapt it in order to convey a similar meaning using the names of various European cities.

- 1 **Elvira** not as ulu
 2 or as the other buildings where these events take place=
 3 **Eshal** =yea::h i went to ulu in september
 4 **Elvira** yeah too much rubbish day by day more and more there
 5 and day by day was getting worse and worse
 6 and i discussed this with my friends
 7 in the spanish society of my college
 8 and we were saying that the situation
 9 we were saying i'll say that in english to you
 10 hahaha the situation was going **from guatemala to guatepeor**
 11 (2.3)
 12 **Eshal** sorry i [can't un[derstand] you]
 13 **Shivani** [i heard [guatemala]la the] rest i don't know
 14 **Elvira** [oh sorry]
 15 haha in spanish mala is bad and peor is worse hahaha
 16 so **from guatemala to guatepeor**
 17 or in english you can say from from bad to worse
 18 **Shivani** i see yeah haha (1.1)
 19 in english it's also
 20 i think it's also going from the frying pan into the fire?
 21 **Eshal** i prefer the spanish one more [stylish]
 22 **Elvira** [hahaha] thanks thank you
 23 (1.9)
 24 **Arvin** maybe then perhaps we could say something from london
 25 we could say something because now we're in london
 26 i was thinking like you know **london and londoff?**
 27 don't know if it's making [sense]
 28 **Ales** [wow↑] why not↑
 29 like on is something good and=
 30 **Halim** =and bad is something bad like spot on or log on and log off
 31 in a way similar to mala and peor as <Elvira> said before
 32 yeah and other expressions can suit other friends
 33 other friends from other countries
 34 **Arvin** what about then what about **paris and parisnot?**
 35 **Halim** hahaha yes why not this one too

- 36 ok let's try to find some more
 37 (1.3)
 38 just thinking any other cities or countries
 39 **Ales** from from in central europe (.)
 40 we could we could say like in germany
 41 **berlin** and **berlout**?
 42 like you are in or you are out of the game or something
 43 **Elvira** very clever one=
 45 **Shivani** =or hey do you know this sign in amsterdam?
 46 that is like amsterdam but they have added i in the beginning?
 47 and it has different colours?
 48 so it's i think it's red then am [white then sterdam white again?]
 49 **Arvin** [i think is the other way round like]
 50 like white red white
 51 **Shivani** anyway doesn't matter
 52 **Ales** yeah the big one the big letters that=
 53 **Shivani** =that you can go and climb them and take photos there
 54 **Eshal** =yes so one could say
 55 **iamsterdam** and **iamnotsterdam** hahaha=
 56 **Ales** =i like it↑
 57 **Elvira** i like it too although i haven't been to amsterdam
 58 (1.4)
 59 **Arvin** yeah so many ways to say the same thing like
 60 like when there's will there's way too hahaha

From the beginning of the extract, Elvira seems firm that she is not satisfied with the litter situation in ULU, the University of London Union of students, when events for clubs and societies are organised there in the beginning of the year (line 1-2). After some subsequent exchanges with her interlocutors, she takes the floor to refer to the latest event there by saying that *the situation was going from guatemala to guatepeor* (line 10). As this expression is unknown for Eshal and Shivani, they request clarification on it. This elicits Elvira's explanation that

in Spanish mala is bad and peor is worse (line 15), hence the word play from *guatemala to guatepeor* (line 16). To explain this word play even better, she adds that *in english you can say from bad to worse* (line 17), as her interlocutors may be more familiar with this Standard English expression. An alternative explanation is also provided from Shivani, who adds that in English there is also *going from the frying pan into the fire* (line 20). Elvira's Spanish word play is taken favourably by her interlocutors, as it is suggested from Shivani's *i see* and *yeah* followed by a repetitive enthusiastic laughter (line 18), and even more from Eshal's *i prefer the spanish more stylish* (line 21).

The approval of Elvira's Spanish expression with its word play, seems to prompt Arvin's reply that *maybe then perhaps we could say something from London* (line 24) and *we could say something because now we're in London* (line 25). Thus, he goes on to share with his fellow interlocutors his suggestion of *london and londoff* (line 26). Again, this word play too is received very positively from Ales and Halim, as it becomes clear from Ales' *wow why not* in an enthusiastic rising intonation (line 28), and Halim's sentence completion to add that *log on* is for something good just like *spot on* whereas *log off* is for something bad, almost similar to the suffices *-mala* and *-peor*, as he argues (lines 30-31). Halim continues and proposes *paris and parisnot* (line 34). Halim's enthusiastic repetitive laughter and his *yeah why not this one too* (line 35) clearly signal his approval of this expression too (lines 36). Ales, then, thinks of Germany and he proposes *berlin and berlout* (line 41), justifying it by reminding everyone the expressions *you are in* or *you are out of the game* (line 42), and Elvira shows

her approval of that expression with her comment *very clever one* (line 43). At this point, Shivani, Arvin, Ales and Eshal start discussing Amsterdam and its famous touristic attraction of the sign with the big white and red letters (lines 44-53), and Eshal's proposal is that one could also say *iamsterdam and iamnotsterdam* (line 55). This is also an expression which is welcomed by Ales, as it is shown with his latching *i like it* in an enthusiastic rising intonation (line 56) and Elvira's *i like it too* (line 57). In this collaborative and supportive environment, Elvira initially used a Spanish expression, which the students welcomed in their ELF-mediated conversation, and then they started adapting it. Hence, the achieved pragmatic function '*making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group*'.

7.4. Making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience

In the previous extracts, it is shown that the students used language flexibly, in so far as they would use a particular idiomatic expression and then in a co-operative and collaborative way they would set out to adapt it in order to meet their communicative objectives. In particular, as the original idiomatic expressions included names of rivers, mountains and cities, the students were using the respective names of rivers, mountains and cities from the countries where they were coming from, or from the city and country in which they lived and study at that point, in order for their adapted expressions to be more relevant to the cultural background of their in-group. The following two extracts

are different in the sense that the students, after certain idiomatic expression were used, were setting out to adapt them in a way that would make them more relevant to the cultural background of others too outside the in-group to which they belonged. Hence, the name of the pragmatic sub-function which was decided for that matter was *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience'*.

7.4.1. 'It's all Greek to me'

(Actual meaning: 'It's all incomprehensible to me', 'I can't understand anything' / Revised as: 'It's all Esperanto language to me' / Participants: Arvin - L1 Mauritius Creole, Elvira - L1 Spanish, Leonidas - L1 Greek, Linlin - L1 Mandarin Chinese)

The first one of these two extracts, taken from the fourth meeting of the society, looks at an episode in which the students discuss how to fill in the form 'Long Term Development Plan' which the University of London Union requires at the end of each year. The form contains some bureaucratic and business terminology, which initially confuses the students. Then, the expression *it's all greek to me* is used, and then the students set out to adapt it.

- | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|
| 1 | Linlin | and i see here in the first section (.) |
| 2 | | agm |
| 3 | Elvira | yeah what's that? |
| 4 | Leonidas | that's annual general meeting= |
| 5 | Linlin | =yeah i knew that |
| 6 | Elvira | thanks |

- 7 (3.4 [turning some pages])
- 8 **Linlin** and then here do you see that? (.)
- 9 swot?
- 10 **Elvira** yeah what's this again?
- 11 **Linlin** oh it says here there's an explanation
- 12 strengths weaknesses opportunities and threats
- 13 **Leonidas** yeah i saw that it's ex[planation]
- 14 **Elvira** [and what] are we supposed to do with
- 15 with all these?
- 16 to do what with it in agm?
- 17 and mention what in the swot?
- 18 **Arvin** =rela:::x
- 19 we'll find a way to=
- 20 **Elvira** =all these i mean **it's all greek to me**
- 21 (1.9)
- 22 **Leonidas** well i wish **it was all greek to me** so that i could understand
them↑=
- 23 **Elvira** =no i mean the expression in english it means
- 24 it means like you know it's all unknown to me
- 25 or i can't understand anything
- 26 because i guess greek is difficult [for some peo]ple to learn
- 27 **Leonidas** [yeah i know]
- 28 but i've never heard any greek person saying that
- 29 because obviously we know greek hahaha
- 30 so this expression would be the opposite if we use it
- 31 **Elvira** yeah i understand this
- 32 **Leonidas** like who created such expression?
- 33 a linguistic expression which can't be used by all the speakers
- 34 of this language (.)
- 35 this expression should be changed
- 36 so that everyone could use all of it↑
- 37 hahaha
- 38 **Linlin** interesting
- 39 and how this expression should be?
- 40 **Leonidas** <Linlin> hahaha

- 41 well in greek hahaha we say **it's all chinese [to me]**
- 42 **Elvira** [hahaha]haha]
- 43 **Avin** [hahaha]haha
- 44 **Linlin** [hahahahaha]
- 45 i guess because either mandarin or cantonese
- 46 may be difficult for you?
- 47 **Leonidas** well yes=
- 48 **Arvin** =but then again <Leonidas> you're guilty of making
- 49 the same mistake
- 50 instead of the word greek you use just chinese in your expression
(.)
- 51 anyway in both cases then
- 52 as the president of the society that i am
- 53 and also in order to be politically correct
- 54 i have to propose that we should
- 55 we should avoid using expressions which may be too specific
- 56 if possible (.)
- 57 and if possible again to opt for
- 58 for all-including [and all][in]clusive expressions=
- 59 **Linin** [agree]
- 60 **Leonidas** [deal]
- 61 **Elvira** so in that case which language
- 62 which language is the most difficult language in the world
- 63 and also equally difficult language for everyone?
- 64 for some people is greek for some others is chinese=
- 65 **Leonidas** =or for some others may be some languages from africa
- 66 in which people make some strange noises with their tongues
- 67 or some other languages in which people have to whistle
- 68 **Arvin** no no guys you make the same mistake again
- 69 no matter how difficult a language would be
- 70 it would be difficult for you but easy or easier for others
- 71 **Linlin** what about languages that nobody speaks in his country?
- 72 like one could say **it's all esperanto language to me?**
- 73 **Arvin** yeap that's a constructed and not natural language right?
- 74 so nobody knows anything similar (.)

- 75 **Linlin** hm
 76 **Leonidas** hahaha that's sounds
 77 interesting
 78 **Elvira** it's certainly neutral good hahaha=
 79 **Linlin** =yeah like true equal difficulty for everyone
 80 so it applies to everyone the same
 81 **Arvin** yeap thanks that's what i was talking about

Elvira seems too frustrated because of all these terms in their application form and she uses the idiomatic expression *it's all greek to me* (line 19). However, Leonidas, who comes from Greece, although he clarifies the fact that he is well aware of that idiomatic expression, he mentions that he has *never heard any greek person saying that* (line 28), *because obviously we know greek* (line 29), *so this expression would be the opposite if we use it* (line 30), as he explains. As he adds later on, in Greek they say *it's all chinese to me* (line 39), which causes Elvira, Arvin and Linlin to break out with an overlapping repetitive laughter (lines 42-44). But Linlin seems to be well aware of the reason behind the use of the idiomatic expression *it's all chinese to me* in Greek, and she acknowledges that this is so because the two major Chinese dialects, *mandarin or cantonese may be difficult for you* (line 43), with which Leonidas agrees with his *well yes* (line 47). At this point, it is time for Arvin, the president of the society to take the floor. What he proposes is to *opt for all-including and all-inclusive expressions*, as he characteristically calls them (line 58). This immediately elicits Linlin's *agree* (line 59) and Leonidas' *deal* (line 60). Linlin's and Leonidas' agreement is very important here, as these were the two interlocutors whose mother tongues were discussed.

During the subsequent exchanges, the students try to find out how they can adapt the two expressions above. What Arvin explains is that *no matter how difficult a language would be it would be difficult for you but easy or easier for others* (lines 69-70). In other words, Arvin seems to imply that, even the difficulty of the languages which are admittedly considered difficult, will not be appraised the same by all the speakers, and actually for some speakers these languages may be easy depending on their linguistic background, among other reasons. Thus, very successfully, Linlin takes the floor and proposes that perhaps their best bet is to go for the expression *it's all esperanto language to me* (line 72). Arvin finds this a nice idea because *that's a constructed and not natural language and so nobody knows anything similar* (lines 73-74). Leonidas also seems to agree with it, judging from his *that's sounds interesting* (lines 76-77), and Elvira with her *good* (line 74). The episode closes with Linlin repeating that only this language poses *true equal difficulty for everyone* and thus *it applies to everyone the same* (lines 79-80), and with Arvin thanking her as she seemed to have been successful in finding a good replacement for the idiomatic expressions *it's all greek to me* and *it's all chinese to me* as was his suggestion a while ago.

A point which could be reiterated here is that the identification and naming of the pragmatic functions is always a subtle and meticulous process. For that matter, the analysis of the naturally occurring spoken discourse from the student meetings, such as the one above, were complemented with what the students themselves had to say during the post-event interviews which we had.

This turned out to be very useful. For instance, in the comments which Leonidas provided, he talks about that event back then, but at the same time he also tries to shed some light at what he thought they were achieving by means of their negotiation.

I could mention a few things about what happened back then... You see it too, clearly, <Elvira> used this expression, this idiom, *it's all Greek to me*, I explained that in Greece we say *it's all Chinese to me*, and then we all started to see how we can use another expression which will not be about Greeks or Chinese, or me or anyone else in our meeting... But it would be for everyone, an expression with some sort of universal currency... But there's also something more than that... It's not about the language and if we can be polite or culturally or politically correct. It's about us, and how working with language on language, you know, how we can achieve something nice, a nice feeling from everyone to everyone in our meetings.

(Leonidas)

The usefulness of Leonidas' comments lies in the fact that he does not only provide a description of what he and his fellow interlocutors were setting out to do on that occasion, but he also tries to identify why they did so. Thus, he explicitly mentions that they were trying to provide an expression which "would be for everyone" and which would have "some sort of universal currency". This lends some support to the argument that the sub-function achieved here on that occasion is '*making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience*'. Further to this, Leonidas shares his understanding of the fact that "there's also

something more than that”, and in particular he refers to the fact that this way “*we can achieve something nice, a nice feeling from everyone to everyone in our meetings*”. That is why I argue here that the overarching pragmatic function which the students were achieving is ‘*managing the relational and building rapport*’.

7.4.2. ‘For a rainy day’

(Meaning: ‘For a future need’ / Revised as: ‘For a day with adverse weather conditions’, ‘for when things go wrong’, ‘for when things go the other way’ / Participants: Arvin - L1 Mauritius Creole, Elvira - L1 Spanish, Leonidas - L1 Greek, Linlin - L1 Mandarin Chinese)

The extract below is taken from the fifth meeting of the student society, when the students were discussing the idea of having extra committee members just in case something goes wrong and they need them in the future. Thus, they use the idiomatic expression *for a rainy day*, which they subsequently set out to adapt so that it can relate to everyone’s background.

- 1 **Shivani** and for the committee members (.)
- 2 president, secretary, treasurer
- 3 and then entertainment officer and public relations officer (.)
- 4 and the same for the representatives in the colleges=
- 5 **Arvin** =yes what about them?
- 6 **Shivani** i believe there should be more (.)
- 7 like no more positions but more of us in the same position=
- 8 **Arvin** =what do you mean?
- 9 **Shivani** like president and vice-president (.)

- 10 or secretary and assistant secretary (.)
- 11 or let's say ucl representative a and ucl representative b [or
so]mething
- 12 **Arvin** [why?]
- 13 **Shivani** because in case one of them doesn't want any more or is too busy
- 14 or goes with (erasmus) to another university or finishes his degree=
- 15 **Frieda** =yeah what about it then?
- 16 **Shivani** it will look bad on us to have to announce that the position is empty
- 17 and we'll be too busy to advertise the new position
- 18 and the new person will want to have time to learn what he has to do
- 19 (2.1)
- 20 **Frieda** yeah many issues=
- 21 **Shivani** =so it's
- 22 how we say that in english with money
- 23 but you can say that here too
- 24 let's have some extra committee members
- 25 you know **for a rainy day** [or something like] that
- 26 **Halim** [hahaha no:::]:]
- 29 **Shivani** what's so funny about it?
- 30 why why are you laughing at my idea?
- 31 **Halim** haha sorry i think i disagree with what you said
- 32 no no not with the idea but just with the expression
- 33 no no i mean **for a rainy day** to mean in case something bad
happens
- 34 is like a happy joke for me
- 35 you know born and raised in palestine
- 36 and then there was a family move to nigeria
- 37 **Arvin** hahaha[ha i see]
- 38 **Halim** [ha yeah] a rainy day would be the best thing ever there
hahaha
- 39 **Eshal** yeah it would be almost the same in my country pakistan too
- 40 (3.4)
- 41 **Halim** and even in england it rains every day
- 42 so in english **for a rainy day** should mean
- 43 should mean just another normal [day out there]

- 44 Eshal [not in case so]mething bad
happens
- 45 (1.9)
- 46 Shivani but if you can support my idea
- 47 then then i can support you to find a way to say this expression
- 48 so that it will make sense to everyone's country (1.2)
- 49 so like not for a hot and dry day
- 50 because then it would be normal with all of us
- 51 with pakistan and palestine and nigeria haha
- 52 but not for other countries
- 53 Marat yeap like me from russia (xxx)
- 54 Arvin yes so **for a day with adverse weather conditions?**
- 55 if everyone's country has adverse conditions of course
- 56 Shivani yeap
- 57 and not as an idiom but like normal one too
- 58 like **for when things go wrong?** (.)
- 59 or **for when things go the other way?**
- 60 Arvin they're ok fine by me (.)
- 61 Halim green light from me too
- 62 so we'll not have to carry neither umbrellas nor fans

In the beginning of this extract, Shivani sees the parallelism of having some extra members in their committee and having some extra money, and that is *for a rainy day* (line 25). However, as Halim explains, this idiomatic expression does not make much sense to him, as he was *born and raised in palestine* and *then there was a family move to nigeria* (lines 35-36). What he seems to imply is that the countries in which he used to live before coming to London are so hot and dry that the expression *for a rainy day* would take the opposite meaning. Its meaning would not be 'for a future need', which is the meaning it has in Standard English, but instead something among the lines of 'in case something good happens'. As he characteristically says, *a rainy day would be the best*

thing ever there (line 38). The same seems to apply in the case of Eshal, who comes from Pakistan. As she adds, *it would be almost the same in my country Pakistan too* (line 39). Thus, Halim takes the floor and questions the meaning of the idiomatic expression even in English. As he notes, *in england it rains every day* (line 41), *so in English for a rainy day should mean just another normal day* (lines 42-43), with which Eshal agrees and adds that in this context it would not mean *in case something bad happens* (line 44).

Considering what has been discussed so far, Shivani sets out to propose an idiomatic expression which will have a more universal applicability, *so that it will make sense to everyone's country*, as she characteristically says (line 48).

Likewise, Arvin proposes the idiomatic expression *for a day with adverse weather conditions* (line 54), adding *if everyone's country has adverse conditions of course* (line 55). Shivani's affirmative *yeap* can be taken as a sign that she liked Arvin's innovative expression. However, she has a slight different idea and she lets everyone know that she will not propose an idiom, as was the case with *for a rainy day* and with *for a day with adverse weather conditions*, but *a normal one too*, as she says (line 57). Thus, what she proposes is the expressions *for when things go wrong* (line 58) and *for when things go the other way* (line 59). Again, the interlocutors' appraisal of the adaptations of the initial expression are important in this case too, and Arvin's *they're ok fine by me* seems to be a positive welcoming of Shivani's innovative expressions (line 60). Halim also seems to comment positively on the innovations proposed so far with another idiomatic expression, *green light from me too* (line 61). And Halim

closes this episode with his witty comment *so we'll not have to carry neither umbrellas nor fans* (line 62), as the expressions which were proposed do not have to do neither with rainy nor with hot weather conditions, respectively.

To further support my argument about the pragmatic role of the adaptation of the initially used idiomatic expression in this extract, there is below a comment from Arvin's post-event interview. Arvin's metalinguistic comments were chosen here, both because he was involved in this extract, and also because it seems to me that what he mentions shows his deep understanding of the revised expressions as well as his explanation of the entire process in general.

To me, what counts, I'm result oriented. So, I think I've shown it before during the other meetings back then, and also I've told you every time you've asked me... Language is a means, a way, a tool, like using your hands if you have a skill, or like taking the plane to go somewhere, don't know if I, if it, if it makes sense, no?... So, in our case, (laughing) as the president of the society, I officially say that the end justifies the means, and that it's ok if you edit, change, alter, nouns, verbs, to embrace as many people and as much of life, etc, if that's the way to achieve your result... So, in this particular case, obviously, we were all trying to change, to make it better, this expression, better, you know, to suit everyone... If we wanted, let's say, if we had no time, and so on, we could have avoided that. But in this case, I think everyone also wanted to show that we care about everyone in that meeting, you know, we wanted to an atmosphere of closeness and proximity.

(Arvin)

Arvin was not a linguist and his non-specialist comments reveal this easily. However, his comments here also reveal that he seems to be in accordance with the argument which I try to make here. This is so, because he talks of language as a means of communication with the help of which speakers set out to achieve their objectives. More importantly, he refers to language as something which people can work on in order to “embrace as many people and as much of life”, in other words, to achieve what was put forward here as *‘making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience’*. Last but not least, it is useful to note his explanation as to why the students were doing that. As he says, “we wanted an atmosphere of closeness and proximity”. This contributed significantly to my decision to argue here that the overarching pragmatic function which the students were thus setting out to achieve was *‘managing the relational and building rapport’*.

7.4. Discussion

One of the most important issues with which this discussion could start is the reiteration of the way that the pragmatic functions identified in this analytical chapter differ from the ones which are identified in the two previous chapters. The pragmatic function which was identified in Chapter 5 was *‘achieving politeness’*, which has to do with interactants’ having good manners and etiquette when they interact with others. Quite similarly, the pragmatic function identified in Chapter 6 was *‘attaining cultural appropriateness’*, which is related

to some sort of suitability of interactants' wordings taking into consideration the cultural background of the rest of the people who also participate in these interactions. On the other hand, this chapter identified the pragmatic function '*managing the relational and building rapport*'. Interactants certainly have to be polite to achieve this function, in the sense that there can be no management of the relational and building of rapport if interlocutors are not polite to one another. Likewise, it is rather unlikely that interactants can manage the relational and build rapport with one another if they do not respect one another's cultural background. However, as it was revealed from the analysis of the naturally occurring spoken discourse of the students in these meetings and especially as it was shown in our follow-up interviews, the students' were found to be trying to achieve some sort of bonding and togetherness with one another. Thus, it was argued here that they were effectively trying to manage the relational and build rapport.

In addition, it could be argued that this chapter sheds some more light at what specific action interlocutors take when it comes to maintaining good social relations with one another. As it was mentioned earlier, Fletcher (1999), who put forward the term 'relational practice', Locher and Watts (2005, 2008) and Watts (2008), who used the term 'relational work', Arundale (2006, 2010), who preferred the term 'relational', and Spencer-Oatey (2002, 2009) and Spencer-Oatey and Franklin (2009), who talked about 'rapport', aimed at investigating general issues regarding what the interactants do for that matter. Thus, for instance, they talked about the importance of behaviours such as empathy,

mutuality, reciprocity and sensitivity to others, as well as about the importance of discursive types such as small talk and off-record approvals, or discursive features such as positive humour. The same was the case with Tannen (1984) and her research on conversational styles, such as the high involvement style. However, due to the focus of the above research studies, there were not enough findings yielded regarding the wordings and the other features of discourse which are discerned in interactions in which the interlocutors set out to manage the relational and build rapport. On the contrary, the analysis of the extracts here yielded some specific language-related features in the interactions of the students, namely, it yielded that the students were collaboratively and co-operatively trying to adapt and adjust specific idiomatic expressions so as to render them more relevant to the rest of their in-group or more relevant to a wider-audience.

In doing so, it could be argued that the overarching pragmatic function and the sub-functions identified in the extracts of this chapter shared some analytic sensitivities with the work of Ädel (2010). Ädel looked at how bonding is achieved in interpersonal relationships, and what she found is that the interactants whose interactions she investigated were achieving this bonding with one another by means of achieving certain pragmatic functions. These were *'referring to in-group discourse'*, *'apologising'*, *'mitigating criticism'*, *'agreeing'*, *'aligning with in-group'*, *'commiserating'*, *'complimenting'*, *'seeking agreement'*, *'offering encouragement'*, *'phatic communication'*, *'seeking agreement'*, *'thanking'*, *'responding to thanks'* and *'chatting'* (pp. 2939 and

2942). To these, it could be argued that this chapter with its identification of *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group'* and *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience'* also made a contribution. In particular, it is interesting to note that the students were achieving these two sub-functions not only by working with the language but also working on the language, that is, by adapting and adjusting the idiomatic expressions as well. In particular, these adaptations were taking place so as to make them more related to the backgrounds of the students or to a wider audience which they had in mind, in a way that also highlights the role of English as a lingua franca among speakers who come from ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds. Finally, in addition to the functions-related work of Ädel (2010), the students in these extracts were found to be achieving all these functions and sub-functions not only by using language by adapting and adjusting it, and in addition they were doing so in a way that the resulting expressions exhibited heightened non-conformity to ENL norms.

Further to this, it can be argued that the findings of this chapter contribute to the ELF-related body of work on rapport and its related terms and scopes. As it is mentioned above, some of the ELF studies which investigate the relational and rapport in ELF interactions include Cogo (2007), who finds that speakers often express solidarity by drawing a lexical item from their interlocutors' languages, and Kordon (2006), who finds that interlocutors can thus build rapport. Similarly, Pullin (2009, 2010) notes that in business meetings small talk and humour can respectively contribute to solidarity and rapport among participants. Also, Pullin

(2011, 2013), again looking at business meetings, discusses the way that ELF participants achieve what she calls 'comity' through their linguistic stance. Ehrenreich (2008) finds that in the ELF business settings which she investigated elements from the three characteristics of a community of practice, ie. mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire (cf. Wenger 1998) were also discerned. Also in a community practice framework, Kaloscai (2011) shows that the Erasmus students of her study were going about their needs for solidarity in their interpersonal relationships by means of achieving casualness. Last but not least, Pennarola (2013) looks at the way that migrants from diverse linguacultural backgrounds built a sense of community through careful communication management on the online forums in which they participated. Thus, to all the above, there can be added the findings from the analysis of the extracts here, which yielded that the international students were managing their relational and were building rapport with one another by adapting and adjusting various idiomatic expressions in order to render them more relevant to the rest of the in-group or to a wider audience.

Also, all the above work which the students were found to do here, that is, adapting and adjusting various idiomatic expressions so as to render them more relevant to them, sheds some more light at the idiom principle (Seidlhofer and Widdowson 2007, Seidlhofer 2009b). According to the idiom principle, as it is discussed in the previous chapter, there can be bottom-up and online construction of idiomatic expressions outside the ENL idiomatic usage. Likewise, Pitzl (2009) discusses the above in the framework of idiom re-

metaphorisation and re-awakening, according to which the pragmatic needs of interlocutors in ELF-mediated conversations can lead to the emergence of new metaphors and idioms. Specifically, Pitzl shows that thus the interlocutors of her research data were achieving the pragmatic functions *'providing emphasis'*, *'increasing explicitness'*, *'elaborating on a point'*, *'talking about abstract concepts'*, *'furthering interpersonal rapport in dealing with tricky situations'*, *'making a sensitive proposition'*, *'adding humour into the discussion'* and *'bringing into the discussion the culture of a particular interlocutor'* (p. 317). In a similar vein, as the analysis of the extracts of this chapter show, the students here were revising various idiomatic expressions which they considered culturally tethered. Through this work of theirs, it was shown here that they were achieving the function *'managing the relational and building rapport'* and in particular the sub-functions *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group'* and *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience'*. It could also be added here that the above echo similar ELF-related discussions, for instance, regarding how form follows function (e.g. Cogo 2008) and how pragmatic motives lead to linguistic innovations (e.g. Cogo and Dewey 2006).

All the above work which the students were found to be doing focussed on idiomatic expressions, and this is one of the categories of formulaic language, as it is discussed in the previous chapter too. However, the fact that the students were adapting and adjusting these expressions according to the objectives which they were setting out to achieve each time, lends some more

support to the point which is made in the previous chapter too. That is, there is the need to rethink the nature of formulaic expressions. In the previous chapter, it is discussed that Swan (2006: 6) uses terms such as “formulaic language”, “formulae” and “idiomatic fixed phrases”, Howarth (1998: 38) uses “restricted collocations”, and Mel’čuk (1998: 23) prefers “set phrases”. However, the analysis of the extracts of this chapter revealed that the expressions of this sort are far from fixed or restricted or set or formulaic according to any formula. Rather, in all the analysed extracts here, what is found is that these expressions exhibited heightened ability to be adjusted and adapted so that they can meet the communicative needs of the students who use them this way. It was also shown in these extracts that any knowledge of these so-called formulaic and fixed, restricted and set expressions does not equate to mastery of Standard English (Cowie 1992, Galperin 2009, Howarth 1998, Wray 2002). What could be instead said is that the knowledge of when and how to adapt and adjust such expressions is what some English language skills and communicative skills in general.

In addition to the above, a note has to be made regarding the word play element which was extensively revealed in the extracts analysed above. As it was discussed, Cook (1997: 227) provided a definition of word play as a “behaviour not primarily motivated by human need to manipulate the environment (and to share information for this purpose) and to form and maintain social relationships – though it may indirectly serve both of these functions”. Cook seems to be very careful here with the hedges which he uses,

i.e. “not primarily”, “may”, “indirectly”, in order to signal the potential pragmatic significance which the speakers’ practices and instances of word play may have. However, as he also writes, “though it may indirectly serve both of these functions” (ibid.). In other words, he does take into consideration the fact that word play may have some functional significance in interactions. This is what was found to be the case in the extracts which were looked at here too. That is, the students were found to be participating in all these word play practices and they were thus achieving to manage their relational and build their rapport with one another. The pedagogical implications and applications of all these findings will be followed up on the next chapter of this research study.

7.5. Conclusion

This chapter investigates how the international students of this study were setting out to manage the relational as well as how they were establishing rapport in their meetings. Specifically, it looks at the pragmatic functions which with the use of word play they were achieved when they were adapting various idiomatic expressions, either ENL ones or ones which they were translanguaging from their L1s, in order to establish or maintain adequate social relationships in their interactions. There was first a brief discussion on the importance of the relational and rapport from the perspective of their contribution to social relationships in general. Subsequently, what was shown was that managing the relational and establishing rapport is an indispensable

part of language-mediated interactions, all the more so in ELF contexts. Against this backdrop, what followed was the analysis of the instances with the expressions which the students were recasting for their communicative objectives. Some analytical insights were also drawn from the previous chapters, and in particular the notion of translanguaging and negotiation as well as idiom variation and re-metaphorisation were discussed. As it was argued, the students were achieving the pragmatic function *'managing the relational and establishing rapport'*, and in particular the sub-functions *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the in-group of interlocutors'* and *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience'*.

CHAPTER 8.

IMPLICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

8.1. Introduction

The first analytical question of this research study has to do with the identification of wordings and other features of discourse which emerge in ELF-mediated interactions, as well as their pragmatic roles in these interactions. The answer to this question is provided in the preceding four analytical chapters, in as far as each one revealed a variety of phrases and expressions which contributed to various pragmatic functions in the international students' interactions which were investigated. This chapter aims at attending to the second research question, which calls for a discussion of the findings from the perspective of what these reveal regarding the competences, skills and practices which are necessary for successful communication in ELF interactions. In particular, it revisits Hymes' concept of communicative competence and its related models, as well as various functional accounts of language use, and it shows how the specific functions and sub-functions identified in the analytical chapters of this thesis shed some more light at communicative competence. Similarly, it discusses the practice of translanguaging, which it sees as a corollary of contemporary superdiverse societies, and it explains that the instances of translanguaging identified here had not been previously discerned in related studies. Finally, it moves on to

some pedagogical applications for ELT, and in particular it looks at the fields of language planning and policy from the perspective of curriculum and syllabus design, coursebooks and materials development, teaching approaches and methods, and testing and assessment.

8.2. Language and linguistic theoretic implications

As discussed in the literature review of Chapter 2 and the theoretical framework of Chapter 3, this research study looks at the interactions of ethnolinguistically diverse speakers in ELF contexts which exhibit non-conformity to ENL norms and conventions, but does so from a non-deficit perspective. In other words, it sees ELF communication as comprising a set of resources which are legitimate and ratified and not as failed ENL discourse. In turn, it sees the participants in these ELF communicative events as ELF users in their own right and not as failed ENL learners. And, all in all, it sees the language users utilising ELF in a way which is different from ENL, but not in a way which implies any ENL deficiency. Building on these considerations, in each of the analytical chapters of this research study, what was found was the international students were achieving their communicative objectives by using language in a way that was not conforming to ENL norms and conventions. In particular, they were doing so by setting out to achieve various language functions and sub-functions, which were discerned here, and which had not been hitherto documented in the respective research literature, or least they had not been explicated in this

particular way, or illustrated with specific examples from non-contrived naturally occurring discourse, as was the case here. In this connection, in what follows, there is first a discussion of what the findings presented in the analytical chapters have to offer in terms of recasting some of the most pervasive concepts and constructs in applied linguistics and ELT.

8.2.1. Revisiting communicative competence and related models of competences

This part of the chapter focuses on the epistemological nature of language as well as the sociocultural knowledge which is implicated in the concept of communicative competence. This was chosen as a springboard in this chapter, as undoubtedly communicative competence and its manifestations could be seen as the intellectual anchor of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which has had an unprecedented contribution to a wide array of ELT curricula and syllabi, materials, teaching methods, and testing schemes ever since (see e.g. Savignon 1972, Widdowson 1978). The concept of communicative competence constitutes a rich intellectual enquiry, and it is thus difficult to outline all of its tenets here completely. Having said that, the key competences which have emerged from accounts on communicative competence are discussed below. Hymes noted that communicative competence is an overarching notion, which includes being “able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others” (1972: 277). This is examined more closely below.

The introduction of the term 'communicative competence' has its roots in the work of Chomsky (e.g. 1965), who drew a distinction between competence, thought of as an idealised native speaker-listener's knowledge of a language, and performance, the use of language in actual situations. In doing so, in a sense, it could be argued that Chomsky was based on the fundamental linguistic distinction between de Saussure's (1916 [2013]) 'langue' and 'parole'. That this model's dissection of what was thought of as linguistically required in order to communicate was significantly different from what seems to be the case when speakers set out to actually communicate, suggests that its constituent notions were highly abstracted, and that it was an overly grammar-based paradigm. This did not sit comfortably with the intellectual inquiries of various scholars who sought to develop a more sociolinguistically sensitive and sensible model of communication. For instance, Campbell and Wales (1970) were among the first ones who started critiquing Chomsky's work, and they preferred to talk about their work as the 'strong version of competence' or 'competence 2' or 'communicative competence' (ibid.). However, other than a dissatisfaction with Chomsky's work and its proposed terms, they did not manage to provide any more details in order to make their investigative scope more specific.

For the above reason, it was Hymes with his rich enquiry (e.g. 1971, 1972, 1973, 1976, 1985) who first developed the notion of communicative competence, in as far as he was the one who provided a more comprehensive explication of it. Hymes' communicative competence signalled a shift in the

focus of attention to the social rules of language use, a dimension of language use “without which the rules of grammar would be useless” (1972: 278). The inclusion of the ‘social’ and its attributed significance by definition also called for a close examination of the context in which communication takes place as well as various sociocultural aspects of the context. Thus, speakers can be thought of as exhibiting communicative competence, when they are able to use language taking into consideration all these social factors. In this connection, Hymes (p. 281, bold in the original) suggested that four empirical questions should be raised:

- 1) Whether (and to what degree) something is formally **possible**; 2) Whether (and to what degree) something is **feasible** in virtue of the means of implementation available; 3) Whether (and to what degree) something is **appropriate** (adequate, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated; and 4) Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually **performed**, and what its doing entails.

Hymes also suggested that providing answers to these questions should require empirical research and observation. That is, to describe language, one has to look at the whole gamut of factors which affect language use. For instance, Hymes (1977: 4) observes that “one cannot take a linguistic form, a given code, or even speech itself, as a limiting frame or reference. One must take as context a community, or network of persons, investigating its communicative activities as a whole, so that any use of channel and code takes its place as part of the resources which the members draw”. Quite similarly, Hymes (1994: 12) also

notes that language should be studied “neither as an abstracted form nor as an abstract correlate of a community, but as situated in the flux and pattern of communicative events... [in a way which would see] communicative form and function in integral relation to each other”. These points are picked up again later.

For the purposes of this chapter, two points from Hymes’ work have to be elaborated on further. The first one is the explication that “competence is what actual persons can actually achieve, variable, vulnerable, a function of social circumstance” (1991: 50). The second one is that “communicative form and function [are] in integral relation to each other” (1994: 12). I would like to argue here that this research study foregrounded and shed some more light on the resources which the interlocutors draw from all across their linguistic repertoire in order to make meaning, as well as the pragmatic functional significance of their communicative practices. These points could be considered specific and additional constituents regarding Hymes’ generic notion of communicative competence (see a similar research perspective regarding what could complement Hymes’ work in e.g. Van Der Aa and Blommaert 2011). However, before discussing the contribution of this research study, there is a need to discuss some communicative competence models which have drawn on Hymes’ work. As Leung (2005) explains, these models tried to recontextualise Hymes’ ideas. By the term ‘recontextualisation’, Leung refers to the selective appropriation of knowledge from one field and its transfer to another (cf. Bernstein 1996). The new field was second and foreign language teaching and

learning, with all its constituent components, such as curriculum and syllabus design, materials development, teaching approaches and methods, and testing. I will return to these shortly, after first discussing the communicative models which have drawn on Hymes' communicative competence.

Hymes' communication competence was notably recontextualised in the work of Canale and Swain (see e.g. Canale 1983, 1984; Canale and Swain 1980, 1981). Canale and Swain (1980) proposed that communicative competence comprises four areas or types of knowledge and skills. The first is grammatical competence, which has to do with "knowledge of lexical items and rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology" (Canale and Swain 1980: 29). They argued that knowing the above speakers can produce and understand the literal meaning of utterances with accuracy. The second one is sociolinguistic competence. This "addresses the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts depending on contextual factors such as status of participants, purposes of the interaction, and norms or conventions of interaction" (Canale 1983: 7). More specifically, this appropriateness refers to "the extent to which particular communicative functions (e.g. commanding, complaining and inviting), attitudes (including politeness and formality) and ideas are judged to be proper in a given situation" (ibid.). It could be noted that this includes what Hymes means by "whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated" (1972: 281), in other words, as Leung (2005: 123) puts it,

“probabilistic rules of occurrence concerning whether something is ‘sayable’ in a given context”.

The next is discourse competence. This has to do with the knowledge and skill required in order to combine grammatical forms and meanings so as to produce different types of unified written or spoken texts. As such, it echoes the earlier work of Halliday and Hasan (1976), who talked about ‘cohesion’, and Widdowson (1978), who talked about ‘coherence’. Canale (1983: 9) seems to set out to combine them arguing that “unity of a text is achieved through cohesion in form and coherence in meaning”. The fourth and final type of competence is strategic competence. According to Canale (1983: 11), this refers to the “mastery of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action for two reasons: (a) to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to limiting conditions in actual communication (e.g. momentary inability to recall an idea or grammatical form) or due to insufficient competence in one or more of the other areas above; (b) to enhance the effectiveness of communication (e.g. deliberately slow and soft speech for rhetorical effect)”.

In an attempt to elaborate on Canale and Swain’s model, first Bachman (1990) and then Bachman and Palmer (1996) put forward another model of communicative language abilities based on language testing research. Their version divides language knowledge into two main categories, and both of them are broken down into various subcategories. The first category is organisational

knowledge (1996: 13), which comprises the knowledge needed to control the formal structure of language in order to recognise or produce sentences which are grammatically correct and to order them to form texts. In particular, this category is broken down into grammatical knowledge, which is similar to Canale and Swain's grammatical competence, and textual knowledge, which is similar but more nuanced than the discourse competence proposed by Canale and Swain. The second category is pragmatic competence, which is related to the knowledge enabling speakers to associate words and utterances to their intentions. This category is broken down into three knowledge-related subcategories. The first one is lexical knowledge, which is the knowledge of the literal and figurative meaning of words. The second one is functional language, which has to do with the knowledge of the relationship between the speakers' utterances and their intentions. More on this will follow in the next section, which focuses on speech acts and language functions. And the third one is sociolinguistic knowledge, which corresponds to Canale and Swain's sociolinguistic competence.

In addition, Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurrell (1995), represented their model of communicative competence as a pyramid (p. 10). This pyramid has a circle at its centre so that its three corners are shown, and a circle behind it which runs through these three corners. The inside circle is called discourse competence, and the three corners of the pyramid are sociocultural competence, linguistic competence and actional competence. This latter competence, is construed as language users' competence to understand and convey communicative intent

by interpreting and performing speech acts. The circle behind the pyramid is strategic competence, which is thought of as an ever-present and potentially utilisable set of skills which allows speakers who are strategically competent to negotiate messages and resolve problems or to make up for deficiencies in any of the other competences. The interesting point with this communicative competence model is that it tries to specify the content which constitutes communicative competence. To illustrate this with an example, they conceptualise the domain of actional competence as divided into two main components, knowledge of speech act sets and knowledge of language functions, which are in turn divided into seven key areas, namely, interpersonal exchange, information, opinions, feelings, suasion, problems and future scenarios (p. 22). The above speech acts and language functions will be taken up again in the subsequent section of this chapter.

Expanding the recontextualisation of the previous models of communicative competence, and particularly Canale and Swain's (1980) model, Byram (1997) put forward his own model, which he named 'intercultural communicative competence' (ICC). In doing so, Byram retained the components of linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence, but added the component of intercultural competence. He took into consideration the fact that nowadays speakers do not only set out to communicate with others from the same linguistic community and social context but increasingly across different linguistic and sociocultural borders. Byram argues that this is something which previous models had not explicated (*ibid.*).

The intercultural component here has cognitive and affective dimensions, with a strong emphasis on experiential learning and reflection, and with a growing role for technology. Described by Hoyt (2012: 94) as “a constellation of notions”, Byram’s ICC model contains various skills and abilities towards which learners can orient and against which their performances can be assessed. For instance, he mentions the ability to “acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices” (p. 52), and “use in real-time knowledge, skills and attitudes for mediation between interlocutors of one’s own and foreign culture” (p. 53).

Another model is that provided by the Council of Europe’s *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR, 2001), in which the term ‘communicative language competence’ is used (p. 13). Communicative language competence is conceived in terms of knowledge of three components: language competence, sociolinguistic competence and pragmatic competence. Each of these is construed as knowledge of its content and ability to apply it. In particular, as it is explained (pp. 13-14), language competence refers to the knowledge of and ability to use language resources to form structured messages, and its subcomponents are lexical, grammatical, semantic, phonological, orthographic and orthoepic competence. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the possession of knowledge and skills which are appropriate for using language in various social contexts. The last component in this model is pragmatic competence, and it involves two subcomponents. The first one is discourse competence, which largely corresponds to the discourse competence described in the previous models of communicative competence.

The second one is functional competence, which has to do with the identification and production of language functions and speech acts. More on this will follow in the subsequent section of this chapter.

Taking into consideration the interactions of business professionals who engage in global networks in particular as well as the fact that English is nowadays by default a lingua franca in various contexts, Louhiala-Salminen and Kankaaranta (2011) put forward the notion of global communicative competence (GCC). In doing so, they note that the rapid changes in work environments, especially ones involving the use of new technology and which are affected by globalisation, point to the need to rethink the notion of communicative competence. As they explain, the previous investigations of communicative competence largely ignored the key element of the language perspective, that is, the fact that the ethnolinguistically diverse groups of participants in international communication use English as a Lingua Franca. In particular, their findings indicate that the global communicative competence which they put forward consists of three layers: multicultural competence, competence in English as a Business Lingua Franca (BELF), and the communicators' business know-how. They also argue that their model of global communicative competence "assumes a shared 'code' of the English language" (p. 246), and this is so because "Jenkins, who could presently be characterized as the leading researcher of the linguistic forms of ELF, has introduced the idea of a particular "lingua franca" core" (p. 249). In the same work of theirs, they also acknowledge that "Canagarajah (2007), for example, argues that variation is at

the heart of the lingua franca system, and the variation is primary; this means that communicators at a particular situation understand each other and proceed with the communication using their own “situated” variants”.

Further to the above, the term ‘multi-competence’ was put forward and elaborated by Cook (e.g. 1991, 1992, 1997). Initially, Cook conceived multicompetence as the total amount of knowledge of a language in the mind of an individual (Cook 1991, 1992). In this sense, it could be said, language was construed largely as an abstract entity. However, subsequently, this scope expanded and multi-competence was construed as all the individual’s knowledge of more than one language, be it a mother tongue, target language, and so on (Cook 1997). Very importantly, these languages were not viewed as separate entities stored in different mental compartments, and their speakers were not considered as departing from one of them or deactivating it in order to use another one. In other words, bilingualism was not viewed as double monolingualism, with potentially varying degree of competence in these languages. This means that the multi-competence perspective supported the growing movement in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics with regard to seeing L2 users as language users in their own right rather than as failed native speakers (Cook 2007a, b). In addition, as Cook explains, just as the individuals are seen as L2 users in their own right, so are their community. It is now not seen as a collection of speakers with different L1s, but “as a community with an integral use of two or more languages” (Cook 2009: 57).

Finally, Kramsch (2010) and also with Whiteside (2008) propose an ecological view of language in a way which can lead to what they call 'symbolic competence'. Drawing on Bakhtin's dialogism (Bakhtin 1981), dynamic systems theory or chaos-complexity theory on language (Larsen-Freeman 1997 and Larsen-Freeman and Cameron 2008), and a sociolinguistic theory of language use as proposed by Blommaert (2005), Kramsch and Whiteside (2008) provide a set of tenets which they argue can cater for a more comprehensive reading of linguistic data. Their tenets are the following: Relativity of Self and Other: As Kramsch and Whiteside argue, both the self and the other are not unitary but multiple and pluralistic. This gives opportunities to linguistic phenomena such as double-voicing, parody, and stylisation (cf. Rampton 1995). Also, both the self and the other can be observed both subjectively from the inside and objectively by others. Even the researchers and the categories which they assign are part of this subjective/objective observation. As Kramsch and Whiteside argue, "[a]n ecological perspective on the data can build on the other analytic approaches, and view the unfolding events as the enactment, re-enactment, or even stylized enactment of past language practices, the replay of cultural memory, and the rehearsal of potential identities" (p. 660).

Timescales: The meaning expressed through language operates in various timescales, with unpredictable and unintended multiple outcomes and with multiple levels of reality and fiction. Blommaert (2005) refers to this phenomenon as 'layered simultaneity', contending that discourse occurs as a real-time synchronic event, but it is at the same time spread over several layers

of historicity too. What this means is that interactants may participate in verbal exchanges which may be embedded at different temporalities and thus may bring about different intertextual references. Emergentism: Any use of language does not derive from pre-determined structures, schemata, categories, etc, but are new adaptations which emerge from the seamless dynamism of timescales. As Blommaert (2005: 126) puts it, “[m]eaning emerges as the result of creating semiotic simultaneity”. Unfinalizability: There is not any dialectal unity or any discrete event per se, but only unfinalizability, that is, open-endedness. Interactants comprise not only their physical bodies and their verbal exchanges, but also the remembered, the imagined, the stylised and the projected (cf. Hofstadter 2007). Fractals: There is a concern for patterns of activities and events which are self-similar at different scales, in other words, they are fractals of smaller or larger patterns. For instance, people’s names or ways of greeting or leave-taking are fractals of their whole language and culture.

According to Kramsch and Whiteside (2008), an ecological analysis of language can reveal a much greater degree of symbolic action than is usually the case in other analytical frameworks in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. They explain that social actors in linguaculturally diverse contexts seem to activate more than a communicative competence which would enable them to communicate accurately, effectively, and appropriately with one another (they refer here to Canale and Swain’s 1980 model of communicative competence). In particular, speakers seem to exhibit a particularly nuanced ability to utilise various linguistic codes as well as various spatial and temporal resonances of

these codes. In doing so, they exhibit a particular type of competence which Kramsch and Whiteside call 'symbolic competence'. In other words, speakers' symbolic competence seems to be not only the ability to approximate and appropriate their or their interlocutors' language or languages, but also to shape the very context in which languages are used and learned. Kramsch and Whiteside add that such an ability is reminiscent of Bourdieu's notion of *sens pratique*, exercised by a habitus which structures the field by which it is also structured in a quest for symbolic survival (Bourdieu 1997). Here, however, we are dealing with a linguaculturally diverse *sens pratique*, and as such there is a multiplication of possibilities of meaning-making offered by the interplay of various codes in presence.

I will now return to the second research question of this study and the call for a discussion of the findings from the perspective of what they yield regarding the competences which were identified in the investigated ELF contexts and which are additional to the ones already identified in the research literature. With particular reference to the notion of competences which constitutes a central focus of the second research question, I would like to reiterate that this was accomplished in relation to Hymes' explication that "competence is what actual persons can actually achieve, variable, vulnerable, a function of social circumstance" (1991: 50). This idea of privileging the local and the emergent sits comfortably with Mauranen's (2012: 6) observation that we should be paying attention to "natural norms" that reflect "what a speech community adopts, tolerates, or rejects". Seen in this light, a good deal of the emerging

conceptual and analytic sensibilities and sensibilities in sociolinguistic research resonates with the insights from ELF research. However, all these were not managed to be captured in the models of communicative competence discussed above. With reference to the findings from the analytical chapters of this research study, it could be said that various speech events and episodes were analysed and revealed the contingent and situated nature of competences. These competences of contingent and situated meaning-making identified here were not within the purview of the models of communicative competence and their constituent competences. In other words, the descriptors and the explications of the competences above did not adequately cover the range of meaning-making topoi in which the students were found here to interact with one another.

In the case of competences which are in question here, undoubtedly, as Leung and Lewkovitz (2012) note, it is highly unlikely that any model of communication can address all the potentially contingent and situated meaning-making practices. This is not least because of the increasing mobility of people who move across linguistic and territorial borders for reasons of temporary work or permanent settlement. This is even more heightened in the case of English, which is used as the *de facto* lingua franca nowadays, as this research study has extensively discussed in line with the ELF literature (e.g. Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey 2011). In such dynamic and fluid encounters and contexts, adherence to NS norms and conventions may not be a priority, and may not even be a consideration (*ibid*). On the contrary, with such dynamism and fluidity being the

case, there is contingency for novel forms which emerge *in situ*. In all the extracts which are analysed for the purposes of this research study, such meaning-making processes were achieved co-operatively and collaboratively, with speakers making use of all the linguacultural resources which they had available across their linguistic repertoire, in creative and innovative ways, according to their interlocutors and according to what they set out to achieve. All this mosaic of competences was not previously described or explicated in the models of communicative competence above, and this testifies to the fact that, as per the requirements of the second research question, this research study did identify meaning-making competences which were not hitherto described in the respective literature.

Having said that, a caveat has to be made here. Leung and Lewkovitz (2012: 411) provide a review of the field and observe that “[this] suggests a cast of mind that transcends a learned and adopted language repertoire that is based on a pre-specified model”, and they thus introduce the need to look at symbolic competence, as construed by Kramsch and Whiteside (2008), and as discussed above too. Likewise, Leung (2013: 33) notes that “to fully capture the meaning-making activities in situations where speakers of diverse backgrounds interact, a more transcendent perspective is required”, and he again points to Kramsch’s (2010) symbolic competence. Indeed, unlike the previous models, symbolic competence, as a conceptual as well as an analytic heuristic aiming at a more ecological and thus comprehensive understanding of language use, goes beyond reproducing only what has been already described, and it

acknowledges and validates different and new uses of language users' resources. However, work in the paradigm of symbolic competence does not look closely at linguistic interactions, to date at least (Kramsch, personal communication, 10 June 2011). What this means is that, symbolic competence sets out to provide an account of the symbolic work related to various language practices and choices, and what it offers is much needed for our field, but it could be argued that a more fine-grained language analysis would be usefully complementary. In this connection, Hymes (1994: 12) reminds us that "[ethnography of communication] would approach language neither as an abstracted form nor as an abstract correlate of a community, but as situated in the flux and pattern of communicative events. It would study communicative form and function in integral relation to each other". This research study set out to attend to this methodological and analytical precept, and in doing so it managed to shed some light on the wordings and the other features of discourse which were identified in the dynamic and fluid interactions, as well as to discern various pragmatic functions and sub-functions. These are the focus of the following section.

8.2.2. Reconceptualising language functions and social semiotics

An indispensable part of language competences is language functions. It could be argued that competences can be seen as overarching set of abilities, under which go various skills, and the skill to achieve language functions is one of them. This echoes a previous sentiment from Hymes, who noted that

communicative competence is an overarching category which includes being “able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others” (1972: 277). The importance of language functions in language pedagogy was highlighted early on too. For that matter, Strevens (1980: 116) observed that the explication of language functions for pedagogical reasons “presented to many people for the first time the possibility of describing, at a new and higher level of generality, that which learners need to learn and hence which teachers need to teach”. The pedagogical aspect of language functions are discussed in the following section with the pedagogical applications. More immediately, there is a discussion of how language functions have been approached in the literature from a theoretical point of view, which can constitute some sort of a background against which the pedagogical discussion can follow.

Early on in his ethnographic research, Malinowski observed that not all language interactions have a referential orientation, and he coined the phrase ‘phatic communion’ (from the Greek word ‘phatos’ which means ‘spoken’), in order to refer to “the use of language... when the object of talk is not to achieve some aim but the exchange of words almost as an end in itself” (1923: 312-313). Examples of this sort include enquiries about the interlocutor’s health, comments about the weather, other affirmations of some obvious state of things, and so on. In these case, words are used to “fulfil a social function” (p. 315). Phatic communion, also referred to as phatic communication, is a topic of frequent discussion in applied linguistics and communication studies. Crystal

(1987) sees it as language for the purpose of maintaining rapport because the immediacy of speech makes it ideal for phatic or other social functions.

Similarly, Coupland, Coupland and Robinson (1992) describe it as talk during which the relational goal supersedes their commitment to instrumentality and factuality.

Malinowski's work subsequently played a role in British linguistics and especially in London School associated with Firth (see e.g. 1957). In particular, Firth was influenced by Malinowski's social anthropological ethnographic studies, which led him to recognise the significance of the context of the situation, that is, the contexts in which an utterance is spoken, as well as the context of reference, that is, the topic of an utterance, and in turn to explain linguistic choices. In the same vein, Firth analysed language from the perspective of its relationships with contextual factors such as the participants' non-verbal actions, the relevant objects which surrounded the speakers, as well as the effects which are brought about by verbal action. Thus, Firth started identifying functions of speech, such as addresses, greetings, creating solidarity, adjustments of relations, farewells, in terms of their social value as acts. Trim (2011) acknowledges the work of Firth by referring to it as having influenced significantly the CEFR, and Green (2011) calls neo-Firthian the subsequent functions-related work of Halliday.

Setting out to study speech as embedded in social units whereby both speakers and listeners play an important role, Jakobson (1960) built on Malinowski's

previous work as well as he expanded on Bühler's (1934) 'Organon model' of communication and deixis as a linguistic phenomenon. In 'Organon', Bühler included three factors, namely, representation, expression and appeal. To each of these three factors, a language function corresponds. In an expansion of this model, Jakobson kept the notion of factors as well as he kept these three functions, and added three more. Thus, he proposed the speech event model comprising six "constitutive factors", each of which "determines a different function of language" (p. 353). These six functions are the emotive, referential, poetic, phatic, metalingual and conative. Overall, Jakobson's premise was a conception of language as a goal-oriented activity which allows to connect the study of linguistic forms with the study of social functions. Something which is important to note here is that Jakobson explains that more than one function may be discerned at times. For instance, the emotive and the conative function may be at play at the same time. Even when people express imprecations after an adverse happening such as stumbling or slipping, and they produce expletives, a certain amount of recipient design is at work (cf. Duranti 1997).

Jakobson's premise about seeing language as a goal-orienting activity became even more central in the work of Hymes (1961, 1964, 1991, 2001[1977], with Cazden and John 1972) and call for an ethnography of communication, in which the functions of language in social life represented a break from structural linguistics. In doing so, he paid homage to Jakobson, for whom he wrote that "[his] crucial contribution was to introduce a 'functionalist' perspective and to do so in a way that suggested an empirical, manageable way of dealing with

speech functions” (Hymes, 1964: 364). This was apparent in all three blocks of Hymes’ scope, namely, interest in the communicative events which constitute social life, a model to account for the various components of these events, and the belief that the above are best if not only researched adopting ethnographic methods. Hymes explicitly built of Jakobson’s speech event model, in so far as he refined and expanded his six functions into a list which initially comprised six functions, namely, poetic, contact, reference, metalinguistic, expressive and directive (*ibid.*), and then sixteen (Cazden, John and Hymes 1972). To make this last list easy to remember, he regrouped these sixteen functions under the letters of the term ‘SPEAKING’, an acronym in which there is the following correspondence: S: situation, P: participants, E: ends, A: act sequences, K: key, I: instrumentalities, N: norm, and G: genre. With particular reference to functions, which is the focus of this section, Hymes (2001[1977]: 12) notes that “[ethnography of communication] would approach language neither as an abstracted form nor as an abstract correlate of a community, but as situated in the flux and pattern of communicative events. It would study communicative form and function in integral relation to each other”.

Halliday (e.g. 1975, 1978, 1995; Halliday and Matthiesen 2014), in his Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), put forward various functions and metafunctions. He saw language as a social phenomenon which is functional, that is, it is concerned with those mechanisms which lead to meaning-making. In SFL, Halliday (1975) argues that there are two basic functions of language in relation to the social environment in which it is used. The first one is to make sense of

the experience and the second is to act out social relationships, by means of naming things, construing them into categories, construing these categories into taxonomies, and so on. In other words, language use contributes to the construal of the context, and in turn the context plays role in the language choices which are made. To be more specific, in SFL, the context of situation rendered the ideas of three metafunctions (Halliday 1978). The first metafunction is the ideational one, which provides grammatical resources at clause level in order to express the experiential and in which the content of the text explains the speakers' experience of the outer world in the environment. The second one is the textual, which deals with the coherence and cohesiveness regarding the organisation of linguistic information in the clause. And the last one is interpersonal, which deals with the social as well as the power relations among interlocutors, and it relates their roles to the discourse which they produce.

These metafunctions set the basis for another set of seven micro-functions. First is the instrumental, to express needs and desires. Second is the regulatory, which includes rules, orders, suggestions, and so on. Third is the interactional, which includes for instance patterns of greeting and leave-taking. Fourth is the personal function, which is associated with speakers' talk about themselves. Fifth is the heuristic, which focuses on asking questions. Sixth is the imaginative, which is used for supposing and hypothesising. And seventh is the informative, which emphasises the affirmation or negation of statements. In this connection, Halliday introduced the term 'social semiotics', when he used

the term in the title of his book *Language as Social Semiotic* (1978). He thus showed that he is against the traditional separation between language and society, and he aimed at exemplifying the start of a 'semiotic' approach, whereby language constitutes a system of "meaning potential" (p. 39). As it was subsequently put quite similarly, SFL aims at accounting for the "semiotic dimensions that define the 'architecture' of language in context" (Halliday and Matthiesen 2014: 50).

Lastly, language functions played an important role in the series of language-related official documents and guidelines published by the Council of Europe. As Trim, director of the Council of Europe's modern language project from 1971 to 1997, noted (van Ek 1975: 1), "the grammar and the lexicon is not an end in itself, it is simply a tool for the performance of the communicative functions, which are what really matter". Thus, based on the body of work on speech acts, the Council of Europe concerned themselves not with a grammatical or lexical but with a functional development (see e.g. Wilkins 1972; van Ek 1977; van Ek and Trim 1991a, b, 1997). That is, their interest was not in what speakers know about the language but rather what they can do with it in social contexts. In the CEFR (Council of Europe 2001), the model of communicative competence put forward is made up of linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence and discourse competence, as discussed in the previous section, and these competences are said to be realised by various pragmatic functions. Just to illustrate this with an example, discourse competence includes functional competence, which in turn includes the so called 'microfunctions' such as

imparting and seeing factual information and expressing and finding out attitudes (p. 110), and 'macrofunctions' such as description, narration, etc (ibid.). Again, it should be reiterated that the CEFR will be discussed at more length in the subsequent section which deals with language planning and policy, particularly from the perspective of questioning the native speaker as the model for communication, against whom all speakers' productive and receptive language skills are to be measured.

From the above, it is clear that there is an increased interest in the literature towards a post-structural perspective on language. In other words, language is not construed as a secondary articulation of a primary reality, but as an indispensable constituent of the primary reality itself with which it is always in a dialogic relationship. Language is thus investigated with reference to its interplay with the wider context and how this contributes to meaning-making. This meaning-making is not something which takes place in a vacuum. Instead, the body of work discussed above shows that meaning is extensively thought of as being made by achieving various functions. In so far as this is the case, it is worth setting out to identify language functions, and to consider these in light of language teaching and learning.

In this light, returning to the second research question which asks whether this research study identified any skills which are additional to the research literature, and assuming that the proposition that achieving language functions can be considered a skill, I would like to argue that the analysis of the ELF-

mediated speech events of this research study did identify some new skills. As mentioned above, language functions were used as part of the title of each of the analytical chapters, whereas the sub-functions with the analysis of the extracts illustrating them constituted the main body of the analytical chapters. In particular Chapter 4 identified the language function *'making specific meaning'*, which was broken down into the sub-functions *'filling in a lexical gap'* and *'using some more precise lexis'*. Chapter 5 identified the function *'achieving politeness'* broken down into the sub-function *'displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English'* and *'increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutors linguistic background'*. In Chapter 6, the function *'attaining cultural appropriateness'* was identified as well as the sub-functions *'refining the culturally contested elements of an expression'* and *'replacing a culturally contested expression altogether'*. And in Chapter 7, the function *'managing the relational and building rapport'* and the sub-functions *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group'* and *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience'* were identified. To my knowledge, these functions and sub-functions had not been identified in the literature before, neither in studies on specific practices and issues such as translanguaging and politeness, nor in the studies above which discuss functions from a more theoretical perspective.

The ELF-mediated conversations of this research study point to the need to adopt a micro- perspective in order to identify various instances of functional significance. This is because there was an effort to attend to Hymes ideas

regarding the study of form and function and their relationship, as noted above. This micro- level could not have been attended to if I had not looked closely at the interactions of the students to identify for instance the function '*achieving politeness*' and I had only provided a generic description for that function such as '*doing politeness work*' or '*doing interpersonal work*' or '*interpersonal function*'. I believe that this was something which was missing from the previous accounts of functions discussed above. The same significance to the micro- had been shown earlier, albeit in another tradition, in the work of philosophers of language, such as Austin (1962). Austin did not use the word 'functional significance', but in essence this is what he was setting out to investigate in his work on speech acts. For instance, he discarded the distinction between 'performative' and 'constative' utterances, and he kept only the latter, as he observed that with their speech speakers act upon reality, hence speech acts, no matter whether they do that knowingly or unknowingly, successfully or unsuccessfully, and so on. However, his work did not consider the wider social context. Likewise, the previous accounts of language functions did not take into consideration the demographic changes of speakers, which has led to the use of English as a lingua franca in contemporary interactions of speakers from different linguacultural backgrounds. The ethnolinguistically diverse element of the interactions was foregrounded in Kramsch's (2010) model of symbolic competence, which represents a valuable contribution to the field regarding the understanding of the semiotic process whereby speakers' wordings can be investigated from the perspective of meaning-making. Some notes regarding what these wordings may be follow in the next section.

8.2.3. Reappraising the practice of translanguaging in superdiverse contexts

As discussed above, the international students who participated in the ELF-mediated meetings looked at here were found to be competent language users, in so far as they were achieving a wide range of language functions and they were thus successful in meeting their communicative objectives. In particular, the students were found to make use of all the linguistic resources which they had available, no matter whether these were their mother tongues or the languages of their interlocutors or other language dialects and varieties of which they had some knowledge. This was related to the practice of translanguaging (see e.g. Creese and Blackledge 2010; Garcia and Li 2014; Li and Zhu 2010; Lin 2006, 2012). Translanguaging was highlighted only in the extracts of Chapter 4 and 5, although it was a practice which was running through many of the extracts in the other analytical chapters too. Thus, in line with the second research question, this section aims at bringing together these instances of translanguaging from the perspective of showing that what the students were found to be doing can shed more light at the existing body of work on translanguaging. In particular, translanguaging is linked here with superdiversity.

Over recent years, more people have moved globally from more places to more places. According to Vertovec (2007) this has resulted in new and increasingly complex social formations, which are marked by a dynamic interplay of

demographic variables. These may include, among others, country of origin, which in turn comprises a variety of possible subset traits such as ethnicity, cultural values and practices, religious tradition, and languages. They may also include migration channels, legal status, migrants' human capital which is closely associated with their educational background, access to employment, locality, and the usually chequered responses by local authorities and local residents, who often tend to operate following assumptions based on previous experiences with ethnic minorities and migrants. In order to foreground this level of complexity which has brought about a 'diversification of diversity' (cf. Hollinger 1995, Martiniello 2004), and thus to do justice to the acceleration and multiplication of all these phenomena of migration and diaspora which arguably surpass anything which was previously experienced and studied, the term Vertovec uses the term 'superdiversity' (2007: 1025).

All this superdiverse human mobility and transnationalism has also brought about an unprecedented and heightened linguistic mosaic, in so far as language constitutes one of the key characteristics which people bring with them when they are 'on the move'. The study of this unprecedented linguistic diversity in contemporary world calls for conceptual and analytical changes as well, whereby there is a renewed methodological toolkit with radically recast ideas about languages, language communities, and communicative interaction, in line with the post-structural, post-modern, as well as post-colonial shifts in the study of human and social sciences. Parkin and Arnaut (2014) acknowledge that sociolinguistics has a long-standing tradition in analysing and interpreting

linguistic diversity, but they lament the fact that this was done “until recently within the ‘old’ multiculturalism, or rather, multilingualist mould” (p. 3). Thus, they call for studies which look at language and language interaction by “[r]eplacing the worn-out multilingual model with a more dynamic one but retaining the sophisticated ethnographic methods and critical stance of earlier sociolinguistics (Gumperz and Hymes 1972)”. One of the corollaries of this is the valorisation of the use of all the linguistic features which are available to language users, as long as they can help them meet their communicative objectives. These resources, which can be drawn on, transformed and employed as communicative resources, make up what is termed ‘speech repertoires’ (Blommaert and Backus 2011, Blommaert and Rampton 2011, Rampton et al. 2015, Rymes 2014).

The idea of valorising and validating interactants’ repertoires, although not explicitly referred to this way, was extensively taken on board in the body of work on translanguaging. Initially (e.g. Williams 1994), this was with reference to classroom practices whereby students could shuttle between languages so as to go about their receptive and productive language activities, such as to read and write. This was in order for the students to maximise their communicative potential, lamenting the language education which aims at the development of languages as compartmentalised linguistic systems.

Subsequently, translanguaging opened up to various other domains of language use (see e.g. Creese and Blackledge 2010; Garcia and Li 2014; Li 2016; Li and Zhu 2010; Lin 2006, 2012). What translanguaging postulates

nowadays is that languages are not kept in separate mental compartments, but a communicative competence is built by means of repertoires in which all their language knowledge and skills of the language users interrelate and interact. This is so, because language users may shift from one language or language dialect or variety to another and draw lexis and other elements from all of them according to what they have available each time in order to achieve their communicate objectives with their interlocutors.

The practice of translanguaging was extensively noticed in the naturally occurring spoken discourse in the meetings of the international students which were investigated for the purposes of this study. In particular, in Chapter 4, Seren drew *çok sert* from his mother tongue Turkish, Leonidas drew *kefi* from his mother tongue Greek, Linlin drew from her mother tongue Mandarin Chinese *diaosi*, and *hold zhu* which in fact started life in Taiwan, Arvin tapped on Eshal's mother tongue Urdu and he used the expression *chamak chalo* that actually travelled there from neighbouring India and Hindi, Ales used *one bell* which he picked up when he went to stay for a while in Birmingham, and Halim used *flash* which he picked up when he left Palestine and went to live for a few years in Nigeria. In Chapter 5, Linlin tapped into her mother tongue and she first translated an expression before using it as *I have seeds*, Eshal used *madar chod* from her mother tongue Urdu, Marat used *blin* from his mother tongue Russian, and also Marat drew *xie xie* from Linlin's mother tongue and in turn Linlin drew *spacibo* from Marat's mother tongue. In a similar vein, in Chapter 6, Leonidas tapped into his mother tongue Greek to access a particular expression

which he used translated into English *as all the goods of Abraham*. Likewise, in Chapter 7, Linlin tapped into her mother tongue to first translate and then use the expression *I was bringing the soy sauce*.

As it transpires, the practice of translanguaging does not associate languages or language dialects and varieties with stable speech communities, and in turn it does not associate these speech communities with certain socio-cultural and national groups. In this connection, it does not refute the combination of language material from a variety of linguistic resources in the course of a single conversation as signalling some sort of a linguistic deficit. Instead, the practice of translanguaging valorises and legitimises the online and rapid deployment of all the available linguistic resources which the language users have available and applauds their eclectic and strategic use, in so far as they contribute to the achievement of a variety of language functions and in turn the enhancement of the communicative competence of the language users. This was the case in the instances of translanguaging which were found in the analytical chapters of this research study. In addition, as it was explained each time, these particular instances of translanguaging which were identified here were not identified before in similar studies. It is for this reason that, with reference to the second research question of this research study, it could be argued that the above instances of translanguaging were additional to the respective ones identified in the research literature.

8.3. Pedagogical applications for ELT

In the previous three sections of this chapter, the key findings of the analytical chapters of this research study were brought together with the aim to show some of their implications regarding revisiting communicative competence and related models of competences, reconceptualising language functions and social semiotics, and reappraising the practice of translanguaging in superdiverse contexts. In this section, the attention shifts to more practical issues, that is, to pedagogical applications for ELT. By ‘applications’, I do not mean that the findings will be applied to any particular ELT programme. What I mean is that there is a discussion of some key areas of ELT pedagogy from the perspective of problematising and critiquing what is currently the case and in turn showing how the findings of this research study could potentially update and enrich the ELT pedagogy. As Blair (2015: 89) puts it, “[a]n ELF perspective on pedagogy necessitates... a greater focus on process than product, involving central roles for accommodation strategies, intercultural and pragmatic competence, flexibility and tolerance of variation”. In that sense, the term ‘implications’ could have been used here too. However, I opted for ‘applications’ on the basis of the fact that this section is about pedagogical and thus more practical issues. Taking all these on board, this section looks at four significant sites in the field of ELT, namely, language planning and policy with a particular emphasis on official curricula and syllabi, textbooks and other related materials, teaching approaches and methods, and assessment and testing schemes.

8.3.1. Language planning and policy: curriculum and syllabus design

The decision to start with looking at ELT-related language planning and policy has to do with the observed significance of national and supra-national policies and initiatives which permeate the pedagogical practice. As Leung (2014) observes in one of his latest NALDIC talks, “all of us know, we don’t need to be told this, in our daily work, in school, and in universities and colleges, what we do is often subject to some degree of influence by policies and initiatives”. This being the case, the Council of Europe’s CEFR is a relevant point for this discussion. This is because the CEFR makes explicit reference to the notion of communicative competence as well as it puts forward a variety of language functions (Council of Europe 2001: *passim*), as discussed above too. Thus, some links can be drawn here as well. As Alderson (2007: 600) notes, “nobody engaged in language education in Europe can ignore the existence of the CEFR”. In addition, the CEFR has informed various aspects of other ELT contexts around the world. For instance, its proficiency levels have provided the reference for the curriculum and assessment framework for modern languages in schools of New Zealand (Scarino 2005), it has also been adopted for the assessment of English as an additional/second language in a Mexican university (Despaigne and Grossi 2011), and even for a test of the development of Chinese as a Second Language in Taiwan (Lan 2007).

At an overarching plane, the CEFR proposes the development of plurilingualism, which it differentiates from multilingualism (2001: 13). As it

argues, multilingualism may be attained for instance by reducing the dominant place of English in international communication and by encouraging pupils to learn more than one foreign language. On the other hand, within the scope of plurilingualism, people do not keep languages in different mental compartments, but they can call upon flexibly all their language knowledge and experience in order to achieve effective communication with their interlocutors (ibid.).

However, the examples which the CEFR provides to illustrate this term do not justify the use of 'plurilingualism'. For instance, it is argued that within the plurilingual scope interlocutors may switch from one language or dialect to another, exploiting their ability to understand one language and express themselves in the other (ibid.). But this is nothing new, in so far as it echoes what Williams (1994) was describing with the term 'translanguaging', as well as what has been shown subsequently in the respective literature (see e.g. Creese and Blackledge 2010; Garcia and Li 2014; Li and Zhu 2010; Lin 2006, 2012), including the analytical chapters of this research study. Similar arguments regarding the non-justification of the term 'plurilingualism', were also recently raised by Coffey and Leung (in Jenkins 2015b, their personal communication).

Further to the above, the model of communicative competence which is promoted in the CEFR framework comprises three types of competences (2001: 12), linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence and pragmatic competence. These competences are expressed by means of six proficiency levels, from A1 to C2, which in turn comprise a set of descriptors expressed in 'can do' statements. However, the descriptors for A1 refer only to linguistic

knowledge and not to sociolinguistic or pragmatic ones, which Leung (2013) attributes to the tacit assumption in the CEFR that linguistic knowledge is the most important component, or to the assumption that speakers at this level do not need to consider any social or other contextual factors in their language-mediated interactions. In addition, although arguably the CEFR aims at being a general framework without everything spelt out in full detail, Alderson (2007) observes that particularly the C2 'can do' statements contain too little information, and one has to 'fill them in', as it were.

In addition, the CEFR mentions that "the aim of language education is profoundly modified [doing away] with the 'ideal native speaker' as the ultimate model" (2001: 5), as well as explaining that "Level C2, whilst it has been termed 'Mastery', is not intended to imply native-speaker or near native-speaker competence" (p. 36). However, there is little evidence of this position, since in the CEFR native speakers are mentioned 75 times as the model in terms of the ideal language user and interlocutor. For instance, throughout the CEFR there is the distinction between non-native language learners and native language speakers. In particular, there is reference to the fact that "[a] place is of course given to these activities... and competences... which differentiate the language learner from the monolingual native speaker" (p. 43). Regarding learners' receptive skills, the self-assessment grid at the C2 level states that "I have no difficulty in understanding any kind of spoken language... even when delivered at fast native speed" (p. 27). Likewise, for language users to develop their productive skills, they are "expected/required to develop their ability to

pronounce a language... by chorused imitation of... audio-recorded native speakers [and] video-recorded native speakers (p. 153). In the same vein, in the grid with the spoken interaction at the B2 level, one of the 'can do' statements is '[c]an interact with... native speakers quite possibly without imposing strain on either party' (p. 74). Finally, in adherence to the CEFR, the Council of Europe's Diagnostic Language Assessment Instrument (DIALANG) was developed to assess the language level in fourteen languages. At the estimated level of C2, there is the 'can do' statement "I can write so well that native speakers need not check my texts" (p. 232).

Lastly, the idealised native speaker continues to be the benchmark against whom the aspired development of sociocultural conventions and intercultural skills are related one way or another in the CEFR. Among others, the CEFR argues that the sociolinguistic appropriateness at C2 level has been developed if learners can "appreciate fully the sociolinguistic and sociocultural implications of language used by native speakers and can react accordingly" (p. 122). Likewise, it sees that the learners' intercultural skills are sufficient if they can exhibit "the ability to cope with what is implicit in the discourse of native speakers" (p. 161). Finally, there is the argument that all these "non-language-specific competences... should be treated in language courses... through direct contact with native speakers" (p. 148). In other words, the CEFR embeds the sociocultural conventions and intercultural skills in descriptors "which are extensively normed on the putative native speaker, a value-based construct presented as a common-sense reference", as Leung (2013: 290) explains.

Moreover, the 'social' in the CEFR is understood as language exponents and communication skills which are stable and thus predictable, and which the learners are supposed to acquire and enact in social interactions, and ideally never depart from them. However, this research study lent more support to the growing body of literature which does not see the native speakers of a language as the ideal and single one model against whom to measure development of linguistic and sociocultural skills. In a similar vein, this research study found that language use and sociocultural conventions cannot be described prior to a linguistic interaction, but are always negotiated and situated, and thus they are decided in a co-operative and collaborative way while the interaction takes place.

I have to make it explicit, however, that I am not against a framework along the lines of the CEFR. As Trim (2011), the director of the committee developing the CEFR, mentioned in a relatively recent interview, "the basic driver [for the development of the CEFR]... was the requirement which was increasingly felt by public bodies and government agencies for portability of qualifications in a world in which citizens would be expected to find employment and to continue their education in environments which are different from these in which they have obtained these qualifications". In that sense, it could be argued that the CEFR, at least in terms of its programmatic announcements, can be seen as contributing to people's social mobility and employment arrangements. However, what one could be sceptical about is content of this framework, and what it understands as language and language use, and in turn how it

constitutes a discourse which subsequently influences national and regional curricula and syllabi. For this to take place take in a more socially sensitive and sensible fashion, there is the need to look at how English is currently used in the contemporary conditions of extensive and sustained social mobility and diversity.

8.3.2. Coursebooks and materials development

In addition to the supra-national documents, such as the CEFR looked at above, or the national and regional curricula and syllabi, all of which play an important role regarding the language content and skills which are put forward for teaching and learning, a similar role is sometimes also played by coursebooks and other materials. This is even more so in case that language teachers are not sufficiently qualified and need more support (Maley 1992), in which case their coursebooks and materials may help them raise their awareness of various pedagogical issues (Cunningsworth 1995, Cunningsworth and Kusel 1991, Littlejohn 1992, Richards 1993). In addition, irrespective of their pedagogical merits, coursebooks and materials may be seen as carrying more weight than teachers' photocopies, that is, as somehow being more legitimate. In other words, coursebooks and materials convey an air of authority and in turn officially sanctioned content. However, just because they are a published and commercial product, coursebooks and materials have been found to be 'reified' (Shannon 1987) and 'beyond criticism' (Luke, de Castell and Luke, 1989), in so far as teachers sometimes accept their claims

unconditionally and uncritically. This is problematic, in so far as coursebooks and materials are very often at odds with research evidence. This section looks at some ELT coursebooks and materials, with the purpose to identify language-related instances which I argue need some more refinement in light of the findings of this research study.

The first coursebook series looked at here is *New Headway*, written by Soars and Soars (2009, 2011) and published by Oxford University Press. It is included in this discussion because it is available internationally, it is provided by one of the biggest ELT publishing houses nowadays, which in fact advertises it on their website as “[t]he world’s best-selling English course” (OUP 2016) whereas they also claim that it features “a perfectly-balanced syllabus” (ibid.). The elementary level of the series is aligned with the CEFR A1 and A2 levels, and the intermediate one covers B1 and B2. The series content is presented in units. Each unit features a theme accompanied by a strapline which displays the respective language content and the activities which follow. To illustrate this, in the ‘Elementary Student Book’, the first unit features the theme ‘You and me’, and is accompanied by the strapline “am/is/are • my/your/his/her • Verbs – have/go... • Possessive’s... • Everyday conversations” (Soars and Soars 2011: 6). The language content focuses on grammar, vocabulary, and everyday English language use associated with different themes. The activities revolve around the receptive language skills of reading and listening, and the productive skills of speaking and writing. As Leung (2013: 6) observes in his discussion of

New Headway, the organising principle for all the themes in this series seems to be the motif 'grammar and real-life language'.

In the intermediate level, there is provision of some sort of sociolinguistic information. For instance, Unit 1 'A world of difference' includes the section 'Spoken English' with the subtitle 'Sounding polite', and it provides the following information: "1. In English conversation it can sound impolite to reply with just *yes* or *no*. We use short answers with auxiliaries. 'Did you have a good day' Yes, I did / No, I didn't'. 2. It also helps if you add some more information. '*Do you have much homework?*' '*Yes, I do. Loads. I've got Geography, French, and Maths*'" (Soars and Soars 2009: 8, italics in the original). Also in the intermediate level, in Unit 2 'The working week', the section 'Spoken English' contains the following: "In conversation, we sometimes don't want to sound too negative. We often soften comments. 'We were late landing'. 'We were **a bit** late landing'. 'My room is tiny'. 'My room **isn't very big**, but it's OK'. (p. 9, italics and bold text in the original). It is also useful to have a look at some information about this series provided on the website of OUP (2016). The proposed interactive exercises and downloadable resources include a 'Phrase Builder', in which students are invited to listen and practise various phrases according to their level. For beginners, some of these phrases are "Can I buy a return ticket to Oxford, please?" and "The cheese sandwich is 90p". Also, for beginners, the first unit is 'At the party'. The section 'Everyday English' features a dialogue in which a girl introduces herself to a boy: "Hello, I'm Flavia... What's your name?", to which the boy replies "Hi Flavia. I'm Terry. Terry Adams".

It could be argued that *New Headway* presents English as comprising a set of homogeneous and tangible language content. For instance, in the first rubric discussed above, which has to do with politeness phenomena, the adverbial “In English conversation...” signals the authors’ belief that it is sufficient to describe politeness in English by providing a supposedly all-encompassing observation to represent the entirety of the English language usage and use. However, as shown in this research study, when using English to achieve politeness, there is the need to take into consideration the entirety of the communicative situation, which irreducibly includes the interlocutors and their linguacultural backgrounds. In the same vein, the inclusive use of the personal pronoun “we” in the rubric “In conversation, we sometimes don’t want to sound...” again implies that the authors rather aim at representing the English language use in an invariant way. In addition, it could be argued that they want to emphasise the fact that they belong to this group of people who actually use English this way, and thus what they say should be taken as an authoritative observation which should be followed. Again, this is not in congruence with the findings of this research study and the ELF literature, which illustrates the dynamism of the English language usage and use. This series may be “[t]he world’s best-selling English course” (OUP 2016), but it could be argued that what they feature is far from “a perfectly-balanced syllabus” (ibid.).

Further to the above, the examples from the OUP website put forward English in association with the Anglo-culture only. One example has a reference to ‘p.’, which stands for ‘penny’ and ‘pence’, which are subunits of the pound sterling,

the British currency, the next one is about 'Oxford', one of the most well-known cities of the UK, and the last one features a dialogue in which a girl takes the initiative and introduces herself to a boy at a party. Again, the authors may have thought that these activities are common in their context, or that the presentation of sociocultural content which is associated with an Anglo-culture may be met with enthusiasm by students who study English around the world. However, these topics and contexts may be irrelevant from the perspective of the potential students and teachers in their own sociocultural contexts, and they may lose interest in their language course. Prodromou (1988) is critical about the promotion of cultural aspects in internationally available coursebook series, from the perspective of the lurking danger of the alienating effects which such materials may have on students' interest in their English language course. Similarly, Gray (2000) reports on a survey which he conducted, in which he found that teachers who were using a particular Cambridge University Press series, found it inappropriate and even insulting to use, because it contained a lot of references to language associated to ordering drinks in pubs, staying out late at night, lying to parents, and so on. The point made here is that, since the English language does not belong only to the British people, but it is a tool for communication among people from differing linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds, as discussed extensively in this research study, the cultural content should be decoupled from the British culture and should take on board this international use of English too.

In addition, the ELT market thrives with stand alone materials in the form of reference books too, many of which focus on a particular aspect of the English language, such as idiomatic expressions. Some examples of this sort include the *Oxford Dictionary of Idioms* (Speake 2000), the *Collins Cobuild Idioms Dictionary* (HarpersCollins Publishers 2012), and so on. In the back cover of the *Oxford Dictionary of Idioms*, one can read “[s]ayings in British English are supplemented by American English... [e]ntries are supported by illustrative quotations from sources as varied as the Bible, Spectator, and Agatha Christie” (Speake 2000: back cover). Inside, the very first idiom and its explanation is the following: “**A1 at Loyds** excellent, first-rate • In Lloyd’s Register of Shipping... Now often abbreviated to simply A1. The US equivalent is *A No 1*; both have been in figurative use since M19” (p. 1, bold text and italics in the original). In the *Collins Cobuild Idioms Dictionary*, one of the first idioms and its explanations is this: “not know someone from Adam... If you **don’t know** someone from **Adam**, you do not know them at all... According to the Bible, Adam was the first human being” (HarpersCollins Publishers 2012: 4, bold text in the original). As is obvious, these dictionaries rest on the assumption that it is sufficient for the English language users to be aware of idiomatic expressions which have to do only with British and American culture, the Spectator, a widely selling British newspaper, Agatha Christie, the famous British novelist, and the Bible, which is associated with the texts of the dominant Christian religion in the UK and the USA. Again, this research study, in line with the ELF literature, has shown that language users very often achieve their communicative objectives not by using idiomatic expressions which are culturally tethered to the Anglo

culture, but by refining and replacing them when they consider them culturally contested. Reference to this communicative practice was not discerned at all in the dictionaries of idioms which were looked at here.

8.3.3. Teaching approaches and methods

In *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (Richards and Rogers 2014), one of the most widely used books in its field, the authors describe a teaching method as the “the notion of a systematic set of teaching practices based on a particular theory of language and language learning” (p. 1). In that sense, priority is given to the ‘what’ is to be taught, that is, the language content and subject-matter. First it is this which has to be clearly defined, and then follows a systematic attempt to find ways for teachers to teach it and for students to learn it. In this connection, they also explain that teaching methods have always reflected the overarching pedagogical and intellectual shifts, as well as wider sociocultural context with all its relevant advents and developments. Since this is the case, they add, English language teaching methods nowadays have to reflect the changing status of English as an international language, since this is the most characteristic trait regarding English use today, as this thesis has also argued extensively. However, it could be argued, this reflection does not take place itself, but it needs time as well as a considerable body of work to make specific links between what is happening in society and how this can inform the classroom decisions which could be taken, that is, to make links between theory and practice. This section aims at

explicating some of the links which can be made between the use of English as a lingua franca in ethnolinguistically diverse interactions and the respective teaching methodology. In particular, two methods have been found relevant for this discussion. The first one is competence-based language teaching (CBLT) and the second one is content and language integrated learning (CLIL).

CBLT is an example of an approach known as competency-based education (CBE). CBE advocates the specification of educational objectives in terms of specific and measurable descriptors of knowledge, skills and behaviours, which students are expected to have attained by the end of their course. As Schenck (1978: vi) explains, “[c]ompetencies differ from other educational objectives in that they refer to the students’ skill of how to apply what has been taught and learnt in situations which are routinely encountered in everyday life contexts. With particular reference to CBLT, Auerbach (1986) provides a useful review of some of the interrelated factors which affect the implementation of CBLT programmes. The first one of them is the focus of CBLT courses on students’ successful future functioning in society. This focus constitutes a goal according to which CBLT courses aim at rendering students able to become independent individuals by being able to cope with the demands of the world after graduation from their courses. A second factor is the focus of the CBLT courses on life skills. Instead of teaching language forms in isolation, CBLT courses teach language as a series of functions which are an indispensable part of communication. In that sense, students are taught those language skills

which are required by the situations and the contexts in which they are most likely going to find themselves in the future.

In addition to the overarching CBE and CBLT characteristics provided by Schenck and Auerbach, Richards and Rogers (2014) discuss CBLT from the specific perspective of language content promoted in such courses. What they have to say is of paramount importance for this discussion. CBLT courses set out to investigate which competences will be central to the life of the students in the future, and state them in ways that can be used to organise teaching and learning units. This means that in CBLT courses the language content put forward is broken down into parts and subparts which can be taught incrementally. As they characteristically say, “CBLT thus takes a “mosaic” approach to language learning in that the ‘whole’ (communicative competence) is constructed from smaller components correctly assembled” (p. 152). In particular, CBLT courses are based on an interactional and functional perspective on language. In this connection, the language theory which informs these courses posits that language can be analysed functionally into various constituent parts and subparts. Thus, CBLT reflects the idea that language forms are to be closely associated with language functions, and students are to learn that certain contexts and situations call for certain types of language. Since this is the case, what is needed is a solid understanding regarding what are the common contexts and situations in which English is used nowadays, who the interlocutors are, and which competences and abilities are required for effective communication to take place. What this thesis shows is that English

continues its role as the world's lingua franca. In doing so, it is being used by more and more speakers who come from differing linguacultural backgrounds. Thus, they achieve a variety of functions and sub-functions, some of which were identified in the analytical chapters above. These functions and sub-functions, and certainly others identified in research studies with similar methodological and analytical sensibilities and sensibilities could be incorporated in CBLT courses. For that matter, however, a word of caution is needed. Leung (2012: 161-162) notes that “outcomes-based teaching... can be associated with the wider policy environments in which the twin doctrines of corporatist management (whereas the activities in different segments of society are subordinated to the goals of the state) and public accountability (which requires professionals to justify their activities in relation to declared public policy goals) have pre-dominated”. This section aims to build on this observation, and in turn to emphasise that research on ELF has to continue in a way that more empirical evidence can be gathered so as to be able to make even more well-informed decisions regarding what is needed in CBLT courses as well.

The second approach in this section is CLIL, which is relevant to this discussion for a variety of reasons. This approach was officially proposed in a European Commission policy paper in which member-states were encouraged to find ways to expand citizens' language proficiency from their mother tongue to more languages. In this frame, there was a start of school courses through the medium of more than one language, that is, more than the national or regional language of the students (European Commission 1995). To this end, gradually,

in the courses which were developed, content teachers started teaching content through another language, but in these courses content from subjects are used in language classes as well. Dalton-Puffer (2007, 2011) elaborates on the popularity of CLIL in Europe and explains that CLIL has become the main instrument for the achievement of the policy aims which are directed at the creation of a multilingual population in Europe. Similarly, Coyle, Hood and March (2010) explain that, in addition to the official discourse behind the spread of CLIL, even families want their children to develop competence in at least one other language (usually English) as a response to the need for knowledge-driven economies and societies in our globalised world. What is interesting to note is that CLIL does not aim at achieving the above by constituting some sort of an immersion English course. Instead, CLIL advocates the development of English language skills in those who will use English as a lingua franca, as Richards and Rogers (2014) note. However, one element which is missing from CLIL is the explicit reference to a theory of language which is to be followed or at least a view on the English which is to be taught and learnt. Having said that, it could be argued that CLIL courses themselves constitute a good opportunity for students to realise that, even if their English language use exhibits non-conformity to ENL norms and conventions, it is sufficient to help them build confidence and develop autonomy and thus go about their course. Then, this will give them the resources to continue along these lines after these courses as well. In this connection, it could be argued that the findings of this research study would be able to inform CLIL courses regarding the language needs of their students.

8.3.4. Testing and assessment

In the previous three sections, the discussion revolved around ELT-related language planning and policy and in particular curriculum and syllabus design, and then around coursebooks and materials, as well as teaching approaches and methods, from the perspective of the English language assumptions which they make, and which in turn they put forward as language content to be taught by teachers and learnt by students. This section looks at language assessment and in particular language assessment via various testing schemes. Language assessment can be seen as a social and political activity and site in which social values are expressed and contested (McNamara and Roever 2006; Shohamy 2001, 2006). As McNamara (2011) observes, as the values of our globalised world have come to occupy many spheres of social and political life, they have also become central to current developments and challenges in language testing and assessment. In particular, these values are embedded in test constructs, as he adds (*ibid.*). Since this is the case, the recent demographic changes regarding English language users point to the need to revisit these constructs. With reference to this and in particular with reference to ELF, Jenkins (2006) explains that this is all the more important due to the washback effect of assessment, whereby teachers and students may find it easier to embrace the content-related changes of any ELT curriculum and syllabus or coursebook and material if these changes are reflected as targets set by official examination boards too.

Thus, this section first aims at taking stock of the current situation with regard to English language assessment as it is provided by two English language testing schemes. The first is the International English Language Teaching System (IELTS). The reason behind choosing this testing scheme is because its provider notes that “IELTS is the world's most popular English language test for higher education and global migration” (British Council 2016). The fact that this testing scheme is one of the most widely acknowledged and taken makes it ideal for this discussion, in so far as the participants in my research study were all university students coming from a variety of differing sociocultural backgrounds, due to which they all had to take this test in order to study in the UK. The second one is the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). This is also an international testing scheme, which is promoted with the statement “Be anything and study anywhere with the TOEFL test” (Educational Testing Service 2016). This testing scheme will be approached here from the perspective of whether it tests the students’ ability to be anything they want, starting from whether it measures their ability to use English in a wide range of ethnolinguistically diverse contexts, which characterise a vast proportion of the linguistics interactions in contemporary conditions. Subsequently, this section concludes with some suggestions regarding what the findings of this research study could contribute to these two major English language testing schemes as well as to other similar ones.

IELTS is offered in two versions, IELTS Academic and IELTS General Training, and it aims at assessing candidates’ four language skills, i.e. the receptive skills

of reading and listening and the productive skills of writing and speaking. Arguably, there has been a considerable amount of research effort to build up its reliability and validity (e.g. Shaw 2003). However, IELTS has also received criticism regarding its efficacy to represent test takers' English language proficiency regarding the types of tasks which they have to deal with in universities (Leung and Oltman 2001). Criticisms have also revolved around IELTS' claim to measure the English language proficiency of its takers and in turn its ability to make claims about their readiness to study in an environment in which they will be using English as their contact and shared language with others (Uysal 2009), such as the UK, Australia and New Zealand. The main bulk of these criticisms has to do with IELTS' adherence to ENL norms and conventions. For instance, IELTS explains that "[a] range of native-speaker accents (North American, Australian, New Zealand and British) is used in the Listening test, and all standard varieties are accepted in responses in all parts of the test" (IELTS 2016). Also, in the Speaking test, what is mentioned is that "[y]ou will be marked on the four criteria of the IELTS Speaking Test Band Descriptors: fluency and coherence • lexical resource • grammatical range and accuracy • pronunciation" (ibid.). In addition, there is a whole section called 'Native English Speakers', which aims at providing them with test taking advice. Even if this advice revolves around the reminder that native speakers sometimes score lower grades in IELTS and thus they should prepare too, the mere fact that there is a separate section for them shows the settled view that there is a difference between NES and NNES.

The TOEFL test is offered in two formats, the paper-based and the internet-based test (iBT). TOEFL also aims at assessing the four macro-skills, while indirectly it also assesses grammar skills and note-taking. One of the disadvantages of its listening section is that it contains only talk under monologic conditions, and only native speakers of English are used in these dialogues. In addition, in the speaking part, test takers are expected to convey, compare and summarise information, explain ideas and defend opinions. One of the criteria against which they are marked is speech delivery, which among others includes intonation, stress and pronunciation (Educational Testing Service 2016). However, Brown (2000) and Mijas (2011) criticise TOEFL's absence of a face-to-face interactive speaking component, and they note that it thus lacks authenticity and in turn it does not allow for a well-rounded assessment of the candidates' oral proficiency. They also add that TOEFL provides holistic scoring and is reliable, but it is not effective regarding measuring specific language knowledge skills which could give the test takers the opportunity to improve until the moment that they would actually use English in their new social or academic environment.

Taken together, some issues can be highlighted regarding both tests, although they may apply to a different degree to each. Both tests seem to prioritise the assessment of candidates' language performance according to a monolithic view that only a particularly set of norms and conventions of English is correct, and needless to say these have to do with the ENL ones. Nelson (1995) criticises international tests because of their monocentric and probably

ethnocentric view according to which ENL is set as the de facto yardstick of candidates' performance. Similarly, Davidson (1994) laments what he sees as a prevalent imperialism of international tests of English, in so far as "they maintain their agency through the statistical epistemology of norm-referenced measurement of language proficiency, a very difficult beast to assail" (p. 120). In a similar vein, Lowenberg (1993) and Hill and Parry (1994) take issue at the conservative stance regarding the perpetuation of the metropolitan varieties of English in international language tests no matter the diverse language use around the world. In addition, both these tests dwell on the psychometric tradition and see language knowledge as residing in the individual. Thus, their effort is to find a way to represent and measure this knowledge. However, they fail to capture the dynamism and fluidity which is inherent in language interaction, and in turn to measure the test takers' ability to use language in unpredictable situations, all the more so when their interlocutors come from differing sociolinguistic backgrounds (see more on that in Leung 2015).

It has to be acknowledged, however, that some of the examination boards have already started efforts regarding how they can go beyond the English language measurement according to what is grammatical for ENL speakers, and make the tests more relevant to the international needs of test takers. As Taylor notes (2002: 19), "[a]s a major worldwide provider of English language tests, Cambridge ESOL has been grappling with these issues for some years". However, as Jenkins (2006) concedes, this is not entirely the fault of the examination boards. She explains that there are still some students for whom

the preferred goal may remain a near-native variety of English, and in turn the testing schemes continue catering for this market. Also, there has been codification of ENL varieties, and it is relatively clear against what standards test takers' linguistic proficiency can be measured for that matter. On the other hand, this is not the case with ELF in international contexts. Thus, Jenkins points to the need for more research in this direction (cf. McNamara 2012). In this connection, since this research study was conducted in the paradigm of ELF, it could be argued that it lent some more support to Jenkins' ideas above, regarding going beyond the ENL norms and conventions, the valorisation and legitimisation of the linguistic resources which the test takers may have available to employ, and the language functions which could be part of the speaking component.

8.4. Summary

As explained above, the first analytical question which was formulated for purposes of this research study had to do with the identification of wordings and other features of discourse which emerge in ELF-mediated ethnolinguistically diverse interactions, as well as their pragmatic significance. To answer this question, each of the preceding four analytical chapters revolved around a variety of phrases and expressions which were found to contribute to various pragmatic functions and sub-functions in the international students' interactions which were looked at here. This chapter set out to answer the second research

question, which called for a discussion of the findings from the perspective of what they could reveal with reference to the competences, skills and practices which are necessary for successful communication in ELF-mediated interactions, and which are additional to the ones which had been already identified in the research literature. In particular, it revisited Hymes' concept of communicative competence as well as the related models of communicative competence, and then various functional accounts of language use too. It thus showed that the competences and particularly the specific functions and sub-functions which were discerned here add to the ones which were discerned so far in the literature. In the same vein, it discussed the practice of translanguaging, which it saw as a corollary of superdiversity in contemporary societies, and it explained that the instances of translanguaging which were identified here had not been previously identified in similar studies. Last but not least, this chapter moved on to some pedagogical applications for ELT. In particular, it looked at the fields of language planning and policy from the perspective of curriculum and syllabus design, coursebooks and materials development, teaching approaches and methods, and testing and assessment. It doing so, it argued for a more socially sensitive and sensible account of language use, in which communicative practices and meaning-making could be seen as contingent and situated, and could thus constitute an integral part of what is there to be taught and learnt.

CHAPTER 9.

CONCLUSION

9.1. Main topics and findings of the study

This research study opened with Chapter 1, with a brief description of some autobiographic elements, which had to do with the use of English which I experienced in my earlier years as an international student myself too.

Subsequently, it moved on to link these with my studies and my life in London and how I started realising that there are much more useful and important elements than linguistic forms in language when it comes to English as a common and shared language for communication between speakers from ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds, that is, as a lingua franca. Thus, it explains how I started realising that what is needed is a better understanding of the 'social', all the more so nowadays that English is the primary language used by ethnolinguistically diverse speakers around the world in order for them to achieve their communicative objectives, as explained above.

Chapter 2 started with a review of how English has changed its status from what once used to be a language spoken only in England to the most widespread language around the world. It then provided a discussion of the implications of this spread with particular reference to the English language itself. Subsequently, it discussed some of the terms and models which have

been put forward to capture this spread of English, as well as its examined why the oft-cited critique against them holds some weight. It then proceeded to the paradigm of ELF. It first discussed how this term emerged, and in doing so in what sense it is different from the other closely related terms and models. In addition, it explained that ELF is able to account for English as it is currently used as a contact and shared language among speakers from ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds. Subsequently, it discussed various ELF-related studies and their findings, and in particular those which looked at ELF from the perspective of wordings and pragmatics, around which this research study also revolves. It then finished with putting forward what it believed to be important and useful to research in ELF nowadays, and it thus formulated the research questions which the subsequent analytical chapters set out to answer.

Chapter 3 discussed some conceptual considerations and in particular the theoretical framework adopted in this study. In particular, it posited that this study saw NNS use of English not as ENL deficiency but as ELF difference, the speakers themselves not as ENL learners but as ELF users, and finally their interactions not as failed ENL discourse but as successful ELF communication. In turn, it discussed various key aspects regarding the overall research design and the data collection and analysis process. In doing so, it justified why a naturalistic interpretive qualitative research approach was adopted. After that, it explained why particular elements from the research traditions of ethnography and conversation analysis were found to be appropriate regarding the focus of

this study by means of combining the consideration of the context of the investigated interactions with a close investigation of how the interactions were unfolding moment by moment. Further to the above, it described how the data comprised naturally occurring spoken discourse from international students, who were meeting in order to establish an international student society at the University of London. It also recounted how, in addition to this audio-recorded naturally occurring spoken discourse from the student meetings, notes which I was taking during these meetings and other notes of the students' linguistic practices outside these meetings which I or they were taking, as well as post-event semi-structured interviews with some of them, were also used in a complementary way during the data analysis.

Chapter 4 was the first analytical chapter. It started with a discussion of instances of translanguaging and their pragmatic significance for speakers using English as their shared language of communication. In particular, it discussed the way that students were making use of the entire gamut of their linguistic resources which they had available by drawing extensively from them, and how they were thus achieving various communicative objectives. Speakers' flexible language use, whereby they make use of all their linguistic resources has come to be known under various terms, and this chapter discussed some of the most widely used of these, such as 'code-switching', 'translanguaging', and so on. It also justified why the term 'translanguaging' was preferred.

Subsequently, it moved on to the translanguaging practices of the students in the investigated meetings. In doing so, the analysis of the extracts revealed that

the students were thus achieving the pragmatic function '*making specific meaning*', which appeared in the title of this chapter, and which was broken down into two sub-functions. The first one was '*filling in a lexical gap*' and the second one was '*using some more precise lexis*'.

The following chapter, Chapter 5, was conceptually related to the previous one, but their analytical focus was different. As mentioned above, Chapter 4 discussed instances of translanguaging and their pragmatic significance from the perspective of how the students of this study were drawing from all their available linguistic resources and how they were thus making specific meaning. Chapter 5 also set out to look at translanguaging practices, but it did so from the perspective of how the students were achieving politeness. In particular, this chapter first reviewed some of the major politeness theories, as well as discussed how politeness has been investigated in ELF research. Building on these considerations, there followed an analysis of politeness instances in the extracts from the participants' committee meetings. As it was found, the overall pragmatic function of '*achieving politenesses*' was identified, and was further broken down into two sub-functions, '*displaying discursive sensitivity through avoiding profanity in English*'; and '*increasing politeness through showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background*'.

Chapter 6 discussed how the international students of this study were negotiating the meaning of culturally contested expressions, and in doing so managed various pragmatic functions related to attaining cultural

appropriateness in their meetings. First, the construct of the negotiation of meaning was reviewed, which was linked to the ability of language to adapt in order to suit the needs of the speakers who use it and the contexts in which it is used. In addition, there was a discussion of similar constructs, such as negotiation for meaning, and Negotiation with capital D. Subsequently, it was clarified that the particular focus of this chapter was on students' idiom variation and re-metaphorisation, that is, how students were proposing revisions of idiomatic expressions, which they considered to be culturally contested and which they were setting out to refine or replace. In particular, drawing on the analysis of the data in this chapter, it was shown that two pragmatic functions were discerned: *'refining the culturally contested elements of an expression'*; and *'replacing a culturally contested expression altogether'*.

Chapter 7 was the fourth analytical chapter, and it was conceptually related to the previous one, as it drew from it the construct of negotiation and idiom variation and re-metaphorisation. This chapter looked at how the international students of this study were managing the relational and building rapport in their meetings. In particular, its aim was to investigate the pragmatic functions achieved when the students were using word play and were revising various idiomatic expressions, either ENL ones or ones which they had drawn from their mother tongues or from other languages which they had some knowledge of, in order to attain or sustain social relationships in their interactions. This chapter first discussed the importance of the relational and rapport with reference to their contribution to social relationships in general. Then, it showed how

managing the relational and building rapport is an indispensable part of social interactions, and in particular what their role is in ELF-mediated conversations too. It was against this backdrop that there followed the analysis of the extracts with the expressions which the students were adapting and adjusting for their communicative objectives. As shown in this chapter, the students were thus achieving the pragmatic functions *'making an expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group'* and *'making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience'*.

Finally, Chapter 8 set out to provide some implications and applications of this research. It reiterated that the first research question formulated for this study had to do with the identification of wordings and other features of discourse which emerge in ethnolinguistically diverse interactions in ELF contexts, as well as their pragmatic significance. To answer this question, each of the four analytical chapters revolved around a variety of phrases and expressions which were found to contribute to various pragmatic functions and sub-functions in the interactions of the international students of the meetings which were investigated here. This chapter answered the second research question, which called for a discussion of the findings from the perspective of what they could reveal with reference to the competences, skills and practices which are necessary for successful communication in ELF-mediated interactions, and which were additional to the ones which had been identified in the research literature. In doing so, it revisited Hymes' concept of communicative competence as well as various related models of communicative competence

and then various functional accounts of language use too. It thus showed that the competences and particularly the specific functions and the sub-functions which were discerned here added to the ones which had been discerned so far in the research literature. Similarly, it discussed the practice of translanguaging, which it saw as a corollary of superdiversity of contemporary societies. This chapter then moved on to some pedagogical applications for ELT. In particular, it looked at the fields of language planning and policy with a particular focus on curriculum and syllabus design, coursebooks and materials development, teaching approaches and methods, and testing and assessment. What it argued was that a more socially sensitive and sensible account of language use is currently required in order for the above fields in ELT to do justice to the way that English is currently used as a common and shared language of communication between speakers from diverse linguacultural backgrounds.

8.2. Methodological and analytical reflections

The present section aims at providing some retrospective reflections on the methodology which was adopted and the analytical process which was followed, and in turn the quality and ethics considerations which were attended to. It could be argued that the overall research principle running through this research study was the aim to make use of a heuristic model in order to do justice to the complexities which my research focus and questions posed. Thus, these research objectives were taken in the Weberian sense (1949), that is,

what was adopted was a methodological antipositivism according to which social actions and practices were investigated through interpretive rather than empiricist means. It could also be argued that this research study was also in line with Bridges' (2003) belief that the social scientist should also take advantage of the contingent boundary between the empirical and the *a priori*, as well according to Hammersley's (2002) 'moderate enlightenment model' which postulates that no research can lead to all the knowledge needed, but rather it just signifies general tendencies for other similar and probable practices.

As regards designing and conducting this research study as a whole, I tried to make it attend to Richardson's (2000) five-pronged set of overarching research study considerations. Thus, I would say that this study managed to go some way towards providing some sort of trustworthy account of reality, to the extent that this can even be claimed to be the case in an interpretive qualitative study such as this one. It is also hoped that it managed to make a contribution towards a better understanding of some aspects of social interaction. In addition, it was certainly intellectually challenging and professionally useful enough to sustain my interest throughout. Finally, it developed my knowledge and skills as a researcher to be reflective enough so as to have adequate self-awareness and self-exposure to make logical judgments, and to have informed opinions about my claims (cf. types of reflexivity e.g. in Foley 2002).

In addition, what is important to note is that Hitchcock and Hughes' (1995) hallmarks of good research study design were set out to be attended here too.

In connection to this, specific language practices relevant to the research focus were highlighted, and a chronological narrative or at least some chronological information about these events was provided. There was also a vivid description of the specific aspects of the way students' English language use in their meetings according to the research focus and questions of this study, as well as there was a focus on individual participants by trying to understand their perceptions of their linguistic practices and meaning-making objectives. Finally, I as the researcher was integrally involved in the investigated events.

Also, this research study was educational not so much in the sense that educational settings were looked at but in that the overall aim was educational (Sturman 1999). In addition, this research study was evaluative in so far as explanation and the judgement were integral parts of the process (Merriam 1998), and instrumental because some sort of examination took place in order to gain knowledge and insights into other issues and topics and not these ones *per se* (Stake 1995). Also, this study could be thought of as belonging to what Robson (2002) calls studies of roles and relationships, due to the fact that the linguistic practices of the participants of my study were mutually constitutive and intertwined with one another. Finally, according to Yin (1994), a research study according to its outcomes can be exploratory by serving as a pilot study to other studies, descriptive by providing accounts of practices, and explanatory by aiming at some kind of testing of initial hunches or hypotheses. In my research, all these three types were relevant and were embodied in different phases of the project. For instance, since the meetings examined here were not looked at

simultaneously but in succession one after the other, the first ones could be considered exploratory as they provided me with the opportunity to come to grips with various theoretical and practical issues which in turn helped me to investigate better the subsequent meetings. Closely linked with this is the fact that the subsequently collected data hopefully added to the description of the initial data in other studies in the research literature, as well as providing some kind of explanation of the field by corroborating or even at sometimes challenging these data and their interpretations.

De Laine (2000) comments on the potential conflicts and tensions between the naturalistic ethnographic researcher *qua* researcher and friend and his human participants. This would perhaps as well turn out to be the case here, if for instance this study had employed a group of students who would be living in my university hall of residence, since many of them would be known to me already. However, as mentioned in the methodology chapter, this cohort of participants and this body of data were eventually not opted for, as it was the members of the international student society and their linguistic interactions that served better the purposes of this study. Such a danger, albeit smaller one, was still there, but overall I could say that our relationships remained professional and did not develop in a way that could have compromised the overall ethical and moral framework of the study and in general its anticipated quality. In this connection, I also tried to observe the conceptual clusters in which ethical dilemmas in ethnography are situated, such as the classic virtues of the kindly, the friendly, and the honest ethnographer (Fine 1993). At the same time, my

intention was as well to incorporate the technical skills of the careful, the observant, the unobtrusive, the candid, the fair and the literary ethnographer (ibid.).

Lastly, it is worth mentioning that throughout the research process I sought to conform to the research requirements and considerations as outlined by the respective institutions and bodies in the UK, such as the *Statement of Ethical Practice* of the British Sociological Association (2002), the *Good Practice in Education Research Writing* and the *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research* of the British Education Research Association (2000, 2011), as well as the *Recommendations on Good Practice in Applied Linguistics Student Projects* and the *Recommendations on Good Practice in Applied Linguistics* developed by the British Association of Applied Linguistics (2000, 2006).

9.3. Closing remarks and directions for future research

At the risk of a cliché, it could be said that this research project has been something of a journey, which is now about to finish. Thus, some closing remarks will be provided here with the intention to suggest some directions for future research. Blommaert (2016) recently had this to say on his personal blog:

I must be emphatic: my comments start from Sociolinguistics and not Applied Linguistics. I therefore have the advantage of not having to carry the burden of concerns – theoretical and practical – characterizing much of Applied Linguistics,

it seems, and – I venture an interpretation – sometimes related to a degree of bad conscience about being in (or close to) the for-profit language industry. In my field, consequently, there is less unease about a possible tension between “theory” and “practice”. Most of what we do is to describe and explain.

I am of the opinion that what Blommaert observes here regarding potential or actual tensions between “theory” and “practice” in applied linguistics is something valuable to keep in mind. Having said that, I am also of the opinion that sociolinguists have a lot to offer to applied linguistics and ELT, by means of seeing their accounts of language use finding their way towards language pedagogy. In this connection, although it could be said that this research study was not a fully fledged sociolinguistics exposition, but only described and explained some social aspects of English language use from an ELF perspective, it could be sad that it managed to make some pedagogical contribution.

In particular, this research study showed that it is important to position ourselves as researchers and our research studies in ways which are much more multidimensional than has sometimes been the case in research in applied linguistics and ELT. Our research studies have to take into account that increasingly the boundaries of the past and the present as well as the distant and the proximal are becoming more and more blurred. Likewise, the boundaries between roles, terms, descriptions and analytical categories are becoming more and more arbitrary in contemporary conditions. With regard to English, which is being used as a lingua franca increasingly in more and more

interactions in contexts which may vary in scope and locality, and by more and more people who come from ethnolinguistically diverse backgrounds, this research study showed that signifiers are no longer transparent and there is the need to reconsider the relationship between language forms and functions.

As mentioned above, the aim of this study was to take account of all this complexity in language usage and use and in turn to provide a socially sensitive and sensible account regarding language competences, skills and practices which are discerned when interactants nowadays use English as their common and shared language of communication. Certainly, much more research is needed for that matter. In particular, it is important that further empirical studies are undertaken, especially from an ethnographically perspective in order to shed more light on the social dimension of language use. There must be found ways to acknowledge and valorise the multifarious ways that English can be used in ELF-mediated interactions, in which speakers make use of all the linguistics resources which they have at their disposal all across their linguistic repertoire, in order to make meaning and in turn in order to achieve their communicative objectives.

REFERENCES

-A-

Aaltonen, A. (2006). Exploring corporate websites as a setting for ELF research: The case of Ostrobothnian export companies. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2): 189-220.

Achebe, C. (1988). An image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's 'Heart of Darkness'. In C. Achebe: *Hopes and Impediments: Selected Essays, 1965-1987*. London: Heinemann, pp. 1-13.

Ädel, A. (2010). Rapport building in student group work. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(12): 2932-2947.

Adler, N. (2007^{5th ed.}). *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*. Columbus, OH: South-Western College Publishing.

Agar, M. (1996^{2nd ed.}). *The Professional Stranger*. London: Academic Press.

Aitchison, J. (1991). *Language Change: Progress or Decay?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alderson, C. (2007). The CEFR and the need for more research. *Modern Language Journal*, 91(4): 659-663.

Ammon, U. (1994). The present dominance of English in Europe: With an outlook on possible solutions to the European language problems. In U. Ammon, J. Mattheier and P.H. Nelde (eds) *English Only? In Europa in Europe in En Europe*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 1-14.

_____. (ed.) (2001). *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science: Effects on Other Languages and Language Communities*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ammon, U. and McConnel, G. (2002). *English as an Academic Language in Europe: A Survey of its Use in Teaching*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Archer, M.S. (2007). *Making Our Way through The World: Human Reflexivity and Social Mobility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arsenault, N. and Anderson, G. (1998^{2nd ed.}). Qualitative research. In. G. Andersen and N. Arsenault (eds) *Fundamentals of Educational Research*. London: RoutledgeFalmer, pp. 119-135.

Arundale, R.B. (2006). Face as relational and interactional: A communication framework for research on face, facework, and politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 2(2): 193-216.

_____. (2010). Constituting face in conversation: Face, facework, and interactional achievement. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(8): 2078-2105.

Auer, P. (1998). From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *InLiSt*, 6: 1-28.

Auerbach, E. (1986). Competency-based ESL: One step forward or two steps back? *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(3): 411-430.

Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

-B-

Bachman, L.F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L.F. and Palmer, A.S. (1996). *Language Testing in Practice: Designing and Developing Useful Language Tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bailey, B. (1997). Communication of respect in interethnic service encounters. *Language in Society*, 26(3): 327-356.

Bailey, K.D. (1994^{4th ed.}). *Methods of Social Research*. Basingstoke, UK: Collier-Macmillan.

Baker, W. (2009). The cultures of English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(4): 567-592.

_____. (2015). *Culture and Identity through English as a Lingua Franca: Rethinking Concepts and Goals in Intercultural Communication*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. (Ed.: M. Holquist, Transl.: C. Emerson and M. Holquist). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Barton, D. and Tusting, K. (eds) (2005). *Beyond Communities of Practice: Language, Power and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Batziakas, B. (2006a). The Greek language: A facilitating bridge or a troublesome background in the teaching of English as foreign language. *ELT News*, 205: 26.

_____. (2006b). Cognition and the language programmes. *ELT News*, 210: 13-4.

_____. (2007). Writing: A proposed answer and top-down analysis of the 2007

ASEP Question 2. *ELT Newsletter*, IV(10): 5-6.

_____. (2008). Surveying the degree of implementation of English as a Lingua Franca in Greek state school English classrooms. Extended summary based on the paper presentation, *ELF Forum 2008: First International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Helsinki, Finland, 6-8 March. Available from <http://www.eng.helsinki.fi/elfa/Batziakas.pdf>. Last accessed: 05-01-2010.

_____. (2009). Micro- and macro- processes and products in the lexicogrammar of English as a Lingua Franca: Initial PhD thesis proposal presentation. King's College London, University of London, UK, 20 October.

_____. (2010). Greek L1 (Greek L1 users of ELF). In R. Walker *Teaching the Pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca* [Section in Chapter 4: The LFC and the mother tongue]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 110-114.

_____. (2013). Investigating meaning-making in English as a Lingua Franca interactions in an international students society in London. In Y. Bayurt and S. Akcan (eds) *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca, May 24-26 2012, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey*. Istanbul: Bogazici University Press, pp: 344-351.

_____. (2016). Making specific meaning through flexible language use in ELF Conversations. In L. Lopriore and E. Grazzi (eds) *Intercultural Communication: New Perspectives from ELF*. Rome: Roma Tre University Press. pp. 273-289.

_____. (forthcoming). Achieving politeness in ELF conversations: A functional-pragmatic perspective. In N. Tsantila, J. Mandalios and P. Ilkos (eds) *English as Lingua Franca: Pedagogical and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Athens, Greece. Publishing house and pages: TBC.

Batziakas, B. and di Scalla, R. (eds) (forthcoming). *English Language Education: Contemporary Implications and Applications*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Baxter, L.A. and Montgomery, B.M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues and Dialectics*. New York: Guilford.

Bayyurt, Y. (2009). The opinions of non-native English language teacher-trainees on unplanned spread of English in Turkey. Paper presentation, *Second International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Southampton, 6-8 March.

Belcher, D. (2006). English for specific purposes: Teaching to perceived needs and imagined futures in worlds of work, study, and everyday life. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1): 133-156.

- Berg, B.L.** (1989). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bernstein, B.** (1996) *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Billig, M.** (1999). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 10: 543-558.
- Björkman, B.** (2009). From code to discourse in spoken ELF. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 225-251.
- Blair, A.** (2015). *Evolving a post-native, multilingual model for ELF-aware teacher education*. In Bayyurt, Y. and Akcan, S. (eds) *Current perspectives on pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca. Developments in English as a Lingua Franca*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 89-102.
- Block, D.** (2002). 'MacCommunication': A problem in the frame for SLA. In D. Block and D. Cameron (eds) *Globalisation and Language Teaching*. Oxford and New York: Routledge, pp. 117-133.
- Block, D. and Cameron, D.** (2003). *Globalisation and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J.** (2001). Context is/as critique. *Critique on Anthropology*, 21(1): 13-32.
- _____. (2005). *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (2013). Language and the study of diversity. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, 113: 1-10. Retrieved from: <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/departments/education/research/ldc/publications/workingpapers/the-papers/WP113-Blommaert-2013-Language-and-the-study-of-diversity.pdf>. Last accessed: 05-04-2016.
- _____. (2016). Superdiversity and the neoliberal conspiracy. Available from: <http://alternative-democracy-research.org/2016/03/03/superdiversity-and-the-neoliberal-conspiracy>. Last accessed: 01-04-2016.
- Blommaert, J. and Backus, A.** (2011). Repertoires revisited: 'Knowing language' in superdiversity. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, 67: 2-26. Available from: <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/departments/education/research/ldc/publications/workingpapers/abstracts/WP067-Repertoires-revisited-Knowing-language-in-superdiversity.aspx>. Last accessed: 01-04-2016.

Blommaert, J. and Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity: A position paper. *Diversities*, 13(2): 1-21.

Bloomfield, L. (1914). *Introduction in the Study of Language*. New York: Henry Holt.

Blum-Kulka, S. and House, J. 1989. Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behavior. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House and G. Kasper (eds) *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 123-154.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Bogdan, R.G. and Bilden, S.K. (1992^{2nd ed.}). *Qualitative Research for Education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bondi, M. and Poppi, F. (2008). How localized is the discourse of the news in English(es)? Paper presentation, *First International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Helsinki, 6-8 April.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). *Pascalian Meditations*. (Transl.: R. Nice). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Breidbach, S. (2003). *Plurilingualism, democratic citizenship and the role of English*. Strasburg: Language Policy Division, Council of Europe. Available from: http://www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/education/Languages/Language_Policy/Policy_development_activities/Studies/BreidbachEN/pdf?L=E. Last accessed: 01-10-2010.

Breiteneder, A. (2005). The naturalness of English as a European lingua franca: The case of the 'third person -s'. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 5/2: 3-26. Available from: http://anglistik.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/dep_anglist/weitere_Uploads/Views/Views0502ALL.pdf. Last accessed: 09-12-2009.

Breiteneder, A., Klimpfinger, T. and Pitzl, M.-L. (2009). 'Transitionary', 'linguistical', 'increasement': Lexical innovations in ELF. Paper presentation, *2nd International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Southampton. 6-8 April.

Bremer, K., Roberts, C. Vasseur, M.-T., Simonot, M. and Broeder, P. (1996). *Achieving Understanding: Discourse in Intercultural Encounters*. London: Longman.

Bridges, D. The ethics of outsider research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 35(3): 371-386.

_____. (2003). *Fiction Written under Oath? Essays in Philosophy and Educational Research*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Bright, M. (2000). Foreign tongues spread the English word. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2000/oct/29/martinbright.theobserver>. Last accessed: 21-02-2010.

British Association of Applied Linguistics (BAAL). (2000). *Recommendations for good practice in applied linguistics student projects*. Available from: http://www.baal.org.uk/dox/goodpractice_stud.pdf. Last accessed: 01-05-2014.

_____. (2006). Recommendations on good practice in applied linguistics. Available from: http://www.baal.org.uk/about_goodpractice_full.pdf. Last accessed: 01-05-2014.

British Council. (2016). IELTS. Available from: <http://takeielts.britishcouncil.org>. Last accessed: 31-04-2016.

British Educational Research Association (BERA). (2000). Good practice in education research writing. Available from: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/good-practice-in-educational-research-writing-2000>. Last accessed: 01-05-2014.

_____. (2011). Ethical guidelines for educational research. Available from: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/BERA-Ethical-Guidelines-2011.pdf?noredirect=1>. Last accessed: 01-05-2014.

British Sociological Association (BSA). (2002). Statement of ethical practice. Available from: http://www.britisoc.co.uk/user_doc/Statement%20of%20Ethical%20Practice.pdf. Last accessed 01-05-2014.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H.D. (2000). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plain, NY: Pearson Education.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruthiaux, P. (2002). Predicting challenges to English as a global language in the 21st century. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 26: 129-157.

_____. (2003). Squaring the circles: Issues in modelling English worldwide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2): 159-178.

Bryman, A. (2012^{4th ed.}). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bühler, K. (1934). *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache* [*Theory of Speech. The Representational Function of Language*]. Jena, Germany: Verlag von Gustav Fischer.

Burke, J. and Christensen, L.B. (2008^{3rd ed.}). *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Burrawoy, M. (1998). The extended case method. *Sociological theory*, 16(1): 4-32.

Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. London: Routledge.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clavedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

-C-

Cambridge Learner Corpus (CLC). Cambridge Learner Corpus. Available from: http://cambridge.org/gb/elt/catalogue/subject/custom/item3646603/Cambridge-International-Corpus-Cambridge-Learner-Corpus/?site_locale=en_GB. Last accessed: 30-08-2010.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with Spoken Discourse*. London: Sage Publications.

Campbell, R. and Wales, R. (1970). The Study of Language Acquisition. In J. Lyons (ed.) *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Harodsworth, UK: Pinguin Books, pp. 242-260.

Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2008). Developing a model for plurilingual competence. Lecture at the University of Southampton, 15 July.

_____. (2011a). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies in translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3): 401-417.

_____. (2011b). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2: 1-28.

_____. (2013). *Translingual practices: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London and New York: Routledge.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J.C. Richards and R.W. Schmidt (eds) *Language and Communication*. London: Longman, pp. 2-27.

_____. (1984). A communicative approach to language proficiency assessment in a minority setting. In C. Rivera (ed.) *Communicative Competence Approaches to Language Proficiency Assessment: Research and Application*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 107-122.

Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1: 1-47.

_____. (1981). A Theoretical framework for communicative competence. In A. Palmer, P. Groot, and G. Trosper (eds.) *The Construct Validation of Test of Communicative Competence*, pp. 31-36.

Canney-Davison, S. and Ward, K. (1999). *Leading International Teams*. London: McGraw Hill.

Carter, R. (2004). *Language and Creativity. The Art of Common Talk*. Milton Park: Routledge.

Cazden, C.B., John, V.P. and Hymes, D.H. (eds) (1972). *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., and Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogic model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2): 5-35.

Cenoz, J. and Jessner, U. (eds) (2000). *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cheng, W. (2003). *Intercultural Conversation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chinese Learner English Corpus (CLEC). Chinese Learner English Corpus (CLEC). Available from: <http://langbank.engl.polyu.edu.hk/corpus/clec.html>. Last accessed 30-08-2010.

Cogo, A. (2007). Intercultural communication in English as a lingua franca: A case study. PhD thesis. King's College London, University of London.

_____. (2008). English as a lingua franca: Form follows function. *English Today*, 24(3): 58-61.

_____. (2009). Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: A study of pragmatic strategies. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 255-273.

_____. (2010). Constructing and negotiating understanding in ELF. Plenary presentation, *Third International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Vienna, 22-25 May.

_____. (2012). ELF and super-diversity: A case study of ELF multilingual practices from a business context. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(2): 287-313.

Cogo, A. and Dewey, M. (2006). Efficiency in ELF communication: From pragmatic motives to lexico-grammatical innovation. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2): 59-93.

_____. (2012). *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca. A Corpus-Driven Investigation*. London: Continuum.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007^{6th ed.}). *Research Methods in Education*. Oxford: Routledge.

Cook, G. (1997). Language play, language learning. *ELT Journal*, 5(3): 224-231.

Cook, V.J. (1991). The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument and multi-competence. *Second Language Research*, 7(2): 103-117.

_____. (1992). Evidence for multi-competence, *Language Learning*, 42(4): 557-591

_____. (1997). The consequences of bilingualism for cognitive processing. In A. de Groot and J.F. Kroll (eds.) *Tutorials in Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 279-300.

_____. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.

_____. (2000). Language teaching methodology and the L2 user perspective. In V.J. Cook (ed.) *Portraits of the 12 User*. Clarendon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 327-343.

_____. (2007a). Multi-competence: Black hole or wormhole for Second Language Acquisition research? In Z.H. Han (ed.) *Understanding Second Language Process*. Clarendon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 16-26.

_____. (2007b). The goals of ELT: Reproducing native-speakers or promoting multi-competence among second language users? In J. Cummins and C. Davison (ed.) *Handbook on English Language Teaching*. London and New York: Springer, pp. 237-248.

_____. (2009). Language user groups and language teaching. In V.J. Cook and W. Li (eds) *Contemporary Applied Linguistics. Volume 1: Language Teaching and Learning*. London: Continuum, pp. 54-74.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coupland, J. (ed.) (2000). *Small Talk*. Harlow: Longman.

Coupland, J., Coupland, N. and Robinson, J.D. (1992). "How are you?": Negotiating phatic communion. *Language in Society*, 21: 207-230.

Cowie, A.P. (1992). Multiword lexical units and communicative language teaching. In P. Arnaud and H. Bejoint (eds) *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics*. London: Macmillan, pp. 1-12.

Coyle, D., Hood, P. and March, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creese, A. (2008^{2nd ed.}). Linguistic ethnography. In K.A. King and N.H. Hornberger (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Volume 10: Research Methods in Language and Education*. New York: Springer Science and Business Media, pp. 229-241.

Creese, A. and Blackledge, A.J. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1): 103-115.

Crisell, A. (2002^{2nd ed.}). *An Introductory History of British Broadcasting*. London: Routledge.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2003^{2nd ed.}) *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2004^{2nd ed.}). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2008). The future of Englishes. Opening plenary presentation, *GlobEng: International Conference on Global English*. University of Verona, 14-16 February.

Cuddon, J.A. and Preston, C.E. (1998). *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. London: Penguin Books.

Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your Coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Cunningsworth, A. and Kusel, P. (1991). Evaluating teachers' guides. *ELT Journal*, 45(2): 128-139.

-D-

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classrooms*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

_____. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles? *Annual review of Applied Linguistics*, 31: 182-204.

Davidson, F. (1994). Comments and replies. *World Englishes*, 13(1): 119-120.

de Laine, M. (2000). *Fieldwork, participation and practice: Ethics and dilemmas in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

de Saussure, F. (2013 [1916]). *Course in General Linguistics*. (Transl.: Roy Harris). London: Bloomsbury.

Denzin, N.K. (1999). Biographical research methods. In J.P. Keeves and G. Lakomski (eds) *Issues in Educational Research*. Oxford: Elsevier Science, pp. 92-101.

_____. (2006^{5th ed.}). *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook*. Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Despaigne, C. and Grossi, J. (2011). Implementation of the CEFR in a Mexican context. *Synergies Europe*, 6: 65-74.

Dewaele, J.-M. 2004. Blistering barnacles! What language do multilinguals swear in? *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 5(1): 83-105.

Dewey, M. (2007a). English as a lingua franca: An empirical study of innovation in lexis and grammar. PhD thesis. King's College London, University of London.

_____. (2007b). English as a lingua franca and globalization: An interconnected perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(3): 332-354.

_____. (2009a). English as a lingua franca: Heightened variability and theoretical implications. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 60-83.

_____. (2009b). Accommodative ELF talk and teacher knowledge. Paper presentation, *Second International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Southampton, 6-8 April.

_____. (2011). Accommodative ELF talk and teacher knowledge. In A. Archibald, A. Cogo, J. Jenkins (eds) *Latest Trends in ELF Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 205-227.

DiStefano, J. and Maznevski, M. (2000). Creating value with diverse teams in global management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(1): 45-63.

Dobbert, M.L. and Kurth-Schai, R. (1992). Systematic ethnography: Toward a revolutionary science of education and culture. In M. LeCompte and Preissle (eds) *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. London: Academic Research, pp. 93-160.

Dollerup, C. (1996). English in the European Union. In R. Hartmann (ed.) *The English Language in Europe*. Oxford: Intelect, pp. 24-36.

Durant, A. and Lambrou, M. (2009). *Language and Media*. London: Routledge.

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-E-

Eades, D. (2000). I don't think it's an answer to the question: Silencing Aboriginal witnesses in court. *Language in Society*, 29(2): 161-195.

Eckert, P. (2003). *Language and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2005). Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of variation. Available from: [www.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/ ThreeWavesofVariation.pdf](http://www.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/ThreeWavesofVariation.pdf). Last accessed 10-11-09.

Educational Testing Service (ETS). (2016). TOEFL. Available from: <http://www.ets.org/toefl>. Last accessed: 31-04-2016.

Eelen, G. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Eggins, S. and Slade, D. (2004). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Equinox.

Ehrenreich, S. (2008). Communities of practice in qualitative ELF research: The case of international business. Plenary presentation, *Third International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Vienna, 22-25 May.

_____. (2010). English as a business lingua franca in a German multinational corporation. *Journal of Business Communication*, 47(4): 408-431.

Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I. and Shaw, L.L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

Enfield, N.J. (2009). Relationship thinking and human pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41: 60-78.

English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings Corpus (ELFA). Available from: <http://www.tay.fi/laitokset/kielet/engf/research/elfa>. Last accessed: 31-10 2009.

English as a Lingua Franca in Asia Corpus (ELFIA). Available from www.ied.edu.hk/rcleams/view.php?secid=190#5. Last accessed: 02-08-2010.

Erickson, F. (1996). Ethnographic microanalysis. In S.L. McKay and N.H. Hornberger (eds) *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 283-306.

_____. (2004). *Talk and Social Theory: Ecologies of Speaking and Listening in Everyday Life*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society*, 5(1): 25-66.

European Commission. (1995). unfollowed reference, in J.C. Richards and T.S. Rogers (2014^{3rd}.) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-F-

Fine, G.A. (1993). Ten lies of ethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 22(3): 267-294.

Firth, A. (1990). "Lingua Franca" negotiations: Towards an international approach. *World Englishes*, 9(3): 299-323.

_____. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality. On “lingua franca” English and conversational analysis. *Journal of pragmatics*, 26: 237-259.

Firth, F.R. (1957). *Papers in Linguistics, 1934-1951*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fishman, J.A. (1965). Who speaks what language to whom and when? *La Linguistique*, 2: 67-88.

Fletcher, J.K. (1999). *Disappearing Acts. Gender, Power, and Relational Practice at Work*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Flick, U. (2004). Design and process in qualitative research. In U. Flick and I. Steinke (eds) *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage, pp. 146-152.

Foley, D. (2002). Critical ethnography: The reflexive turn. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(5): 469-490.

Foster, P. and Snyder Ohta, A. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(3): 402-430.

-G-

Gal, S. (1979). *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.

Galperin, O. (2009). What are language chunks? Available from: http://www.englishgateway.com/Article/What_are_language_forms. Last accessed: 05 March 2016.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.

García, O. and Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Towards an interpretive theory of culture. In C. Geertz (ed.) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 3-30.

Gerritsen, M., Nickerson, C., van Hooft, A., van Meurs F., Nederstigt, U., Starren, M. and Crijns, R. (2007). English in product advertisements in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Spain. *World Englishes*, 26(3): 291-315.

Giles, H. (1984). *The Dynamics of Speech Accommodation*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gilovich, T., Griffin, D. and Kahneman, D. (2002). *Heuristics and Biases: The Psychology of Intuitive Judgment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jimenez, T. (2001). ETS and ELT: Teaching a world language. *ELT Journal*, 55(3): 296-297.

Glendinning, E.H. and Holmström, B.A.S. (2005^{3rd ed.}). *English in Medicine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gnutzmann, C. and Intemann, F. (eds) (2005). *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Nar.

Goetz, J.P. and LeCompte, M.D. (1984). *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research*. New York: Academic Press.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements of social interaction. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 18(3): 213-231.

_____. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

_____. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 8(4): 597-607.

Goncalves, K. (2009). *The status of English and local language ideologies within Interlaken's tourism sector. A case of double diglossia*. Paper presentation, *Second International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Southampton, 6-8 March.

Görlach, M. (1988). The developments of standard Englishes. In M. Görlach (ed.) *Studies in the History of the English Language*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Graddol, D. (2004). The future of language. *Science*, 303: 1329-1331.
Available from: <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/303/5662/1329>.
Last accessed: 23-01-2010.

_____. (2006). *English Next: Why Global English May Mean the End of 'English as a Foreign Language'*. London: British Council.

Gray, J. (2000). The ELT coursebook as cultural artefact. *ELT Journal*, 54(3): 274-283.

Green, A. (2011). *Language Functions Revisited: Theoretical and Empirical Bases for Language Construct Definition across the Ability Range*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, J. and Bloom, D. (1997). Ethnography and ethnographers of and in education: A situated perspective. In J. Flood, S. Heath and D. Lapp (eds) *A Handbook of Research on Teaching Literacy through the Communicative and Visual Arts*. New York: Simon and Shuster MacMillan, pp. 181-202.

Grice, H.P. (1957). Meaning. *The Philosophical Review*, 66: 377-388.

_____. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds) *Syntax and Semantics. Volume 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-58.

Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14: 237-257.

Guest, T. (2007). *Second Lives: A Journey through Virtual Worlds*. London: Hutchison.

Gumperz, J.J. (1964). Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6/2): 137-153.

_____. (1967). On the linguistic markers of bilingual communication. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23: 48-57.

_____. (1973). The communicative competence of bilinguals: Some hypotheses and suggestions for research. *Language in Society*, 2(1): 143-154.

_____. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1999). On interactional sociolinguistic method. In S. Sarangi and C. Roberts (eds) *Talk, Work and Institutional Order*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 453-471.

Gumperz, J. and Hymes, D.H. (eds) (1972). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

-H-

Halliday, M.A.K. (1961). Categories of the theory of grammar. In G.R. Kress (ed.) *System and Function in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 52-72.

_____. (1975). *Learning How to Mean*. London: Edward Arnold.

_____. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. Baltimore, MA: University Park Press.

_____. (1995). A Recent View of 'Missteps' in Linguistic Theory. *Functions of Language*, 2(2): 249-267.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hassan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman,

Halliday, M.A.K. and Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2014^{4th ed.}). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Abingdon, UK and New York: Routledge.

Hammersley, M. (2002). *Educational Research, Policymaking and Practice*. London: Paul Chapman.

_____. (2003). Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: Methods or paradigms. *Discourse and Society*, 14: 751-781.

Hanchey, S. (2008). *English and technology: Serving local needs to meet global standards*. Available from: http://www.amideast.org/about/annual_reports/1998/english_tech.htm. Last accessed 23-01-2010.

HarpersCollins Publishers. (ed.) (2012^{4th ed.}). *Collins Cobuild Idioms Dictionary*. Glasgow: HarpersCollins Publishers.

Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S.B. and Street, B. (2008). *On Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Herritage, J. (1998). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analyzing distinctive turn-taking systems. In S. Cmejrková, J. Hoffmanová, O. Müllerová and J. Svetlá (eds) *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress of IADA* (International Association of Dialog Analysis), Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 3-17.

Hill, C. and Parry, K. (eds) (1994). *From Testing to Assessment: English as an International Language*. London: Longman.

Hitchcock, G. and Hughes, D. (1995). *Research and the Teacher*. London: Routledge.

Hoffmann, C. (2000). The spread of English and the growth of multilingualism with English in Europe. In J. Cenoz and U. Jessner (eds) *English in Europe: The Acquisition of a Third Language*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 1-21.

Hofstadter, D. (2007). *I Am a Strange Loop*. New York: Basic Books.

Holliday, A. (2004). *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holliday, A., Hyde, J. and Kullman, M. (2012). *Intercultural Communication: An Advanced Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.

Hollinger, D. (1995). *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books.

Holmes, J. and Marra, M. (2004). Relational practice in the workplace: Women's talk or gendered discourse? *Language in Society*, 33: 377-398.

Holmes, J. and Schnurr, S. (2005). Politeness, humor and gender in the workplace: Negotiating norms and identifying contestation. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1): 121-149.

Holmquist, J. (1985). Social correlates of a linguistic variable: A study in a Spanish village. *Language in Society*, 14: 191-203.

Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Corpus of Learner English (HKUST Corpus). Available from: http://search.ust.hk/se.cgi? mode= 5 &lmode=0&de=0&so=0&ca=0&ta=all&gr_5=def&qu=The+Hong+Kong+Universit y+of+Science+%26+Technology+%28HKUST%29+learner+corpus+&la=1&gr_1=ust&gr_2=library&gr_3=teach&gr_4=ihome&=Search. Last accessed: 30-08-2010.

House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In C. Gnutzmann (ed.) *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, pp. 73-89.

_____. (2002). Pragmatic competence in lingua franca English. In K. Knapp and C. Meierkord (eds) *Lingua Franca Communication*. Main, Germany: Peter Lang, pp. 245-267.

Howarth, P. (1998). Phraseology and second language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(1): 24-44.

Hoyt, K. (2012). Developing intercultural competence via semi-directed cross-cultural interviews. *NECTFL Review*, 69(1): 94-117.

Hülmbauer, C. (2007). "You moved, aren't?" – The relationship between lexicogrammatical correctness and communicative effectiveness in English as a lingua franca. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 16(2), 3-35.

_____. (2009). "We don't talk the right way. We just talk the way that we think you will understand" – The shifting relationship between correctness and effectiveness in ELF. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, pp. 323-347.

Hülmbauer, C., Böhringer, H. and Seidlhofer, B. (2008). Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in international communication. *Synergies Europe*, 3: 25-36.

Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Oxford: Polity.

Hymes, D.H. (1961). Functions of speech: An evolutionary approach. In F. Gruber (ed.) *Anthropology and Education*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, pp. 315-338.

_____. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin and W.C. Sturtevant (eds) *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. Washington, DC: The Anthropology Society of Washington, pp. 13-53.

_____. (1964). *Essays in the History of Linguistic Anthropology*. Amsterdam, PA: John Benjamins.

_____. (ed.) (1964). *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. New York: Harper and Row.

_____. (1968). The ethnography of speaking. In J. Fishman (ed.) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Mouton de Gruyter: The Hague, pp. 99-138.

_____. (1971). On linguistic theory, communicative competence, and the education of disadvantaged children. In M.L. Wax, S.A. Diamond and F. Gearing (eds) *Anthropological Perspectives in Education*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 51-66.

_____. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds) *Sociolinguistics*. London: Penguin. pp. 269-293.

_____. (1973). *Toward linguistic competence*. Philadelphia, PA: Pennsylvania University Press.

_____. (1974). An ethnographic perspective. *New Literary History*, 5: 187-201.

_____. (1976). Toward linguistic competence. *Sociologische Gids*, 4: 217-239.

_____. (1985). Toward linguistic competence. *AILA Review*, 2: 9-23.

_____. (1991). Is poetics original and functional? *Language and Communication* 11(1/2): 49-51.

_____. (1994). Towards ethnographies of communication. In J. Maybin (ed.) *Language and Literacy in Social Practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, in association with the Open University, pp. 11-12.

_____. (2001 [1977]). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge [original publication: London: Tavistock Publications.]

-I-

Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, 8(2/3): 223-248.

International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE). Available from <http://www.uclouvain.be/en-cecl-icle.html>. Last accessed: 30-08-2010.

-J-

Jacquemet, M. (2005). Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language and Communication*, 25: 257-277.

Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In T. Sebeok (ed). *Style in Language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 350-377.

Japanese Learner of English Corpus (NICT JLE Corpus). Available from: http://www.nict.go.jp/publication/shuppan/nenpou/nenpou_16/nenpou_16data/05-2-1.pdf. Last accessed: 30-08-2010.

Jaworski, A. (2000). Silence and small talk. In J. Coupland (ed.) *Small Talk*. Harlow: Longman, pp. 110-132.

_____. (2015). *Globalese: A new visual-linguistic register*. *Social Semiotics*, 25(2): 217-235.

Jenkins, J. (1996). Native speaker, non-native speaker and English as a Foreign Language: Time for a change. *IATEFL, Newsletter*, 131: 10-11.

_____. (2000). *English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2002). What standard for English as an International Language? In E.L. Low and S.C. Teng (eds) *The Teaching and Use of Standard English*. Singapore: Singapore Association of Applied Linguistics, pp. 25-32.

_____. (2003). *World Englishes*. Oxford and New York: Routledge.

_____. (2004). The ABC of ELT... 'ELF'. *IATEFL, Issues*, December 2014/January 2015: 9.

_____. (2005). ELF at the gate: The position of English as a lingua franca. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 7(2). Available from <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/mar05/idea.htm>. Last accessed: 12-06-2010.

_____. (2006a). The spread of EIL: A testing time for testers. *ELT Journal*, 60(1): 42-50.

_____. (2006b). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(2): 137-162.

_____. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2009^{2nd ed.}). *World Englishes*. Oxford and New York: Routledge.

_____. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4): 926-936.

_____. (2015a). Internationalisation on campus – or is it? Talk. Birkbeck College, 18 March.

_____. (2015b). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *English in Practice*, 2(3): 49-85.

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A. and Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3): 281-315.

Jenkins, J., Modiano, M. and Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Euro-English. *English Today*, 17(4): 13-19.

Jenks, C. (2003). *Transgression*. London: Routledge.

Jewitt, C. (2009). *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Johnstone, B. (2009^{2nd ed.}). *Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jørgensen, J.N., Karrebæk, M.S., Madsen, L.M. and Møller, J.S. (2011). Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2): 23-37.

-K-

Kachru, B.B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (eds) *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and the Literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 11-30.

_____. (1988). The sacred cows of English. *English Today*, 16: 3-8.

_____. (2004). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kaloscai, K. (2009). Erasmus exchange students: A behind-the-scenes view into an ELF community of practice. *Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 3(1): 25-49.

Kandiah, T. (1998). The emergence of new Englishes. In J. Foley, T. Kandiah, A. Fraser Gupta, L. Alsagoff, H. Lick, L. Wee, I. Talib, and W. Bokhorst-Heng (eds) *English in New Cultural Contexts: Reflections from Singapore*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Kapur, D. and McHale, J. (2005). *Give us your Best and Brightest: The Global Hunt for Talent and its Impact on the Developing World*. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development.

Katriel, T. (1986). *Talking Straight: Dugri Speech in Israeli Sabra Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaur, J. (2009). Pre-empting problems of understanding in English as a lingua franca. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 107-123.

_____. (2010). Misunderstanding in English as a lingua franca: Attributing cause. Plenary presentation, *Third International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Vienna, 22-25 May.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2008). English as the ASEAN lingua franca: Why English and what were/are the alternatives? Paper presentation, *First International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Helsinki, 6-8 April.

_____. (2009). Teaching English as a lingua franca. Paper presentation, *Second International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Southampton, 6-8 March.

_____. (2010). English as an Asian lingua franca: Implications for policy and pedagogy. Plenary presentation, *Third International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Vienna, 22-25 May.

Klimpfinger, T. (2007). 'Mind you sometimes you have to mix' – The role of code-switching in English as a lingua franca. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 16(2), 36-61.

_____. (2009). "She's mixing the two languages together" – Forms and functions in English as a lingua franca. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*, pp. 348-371.

Knapp, M.L. (1978). *Social Intercourse: From Greeting to Goodbye*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kordon, K. (2006). "You are very good" – Establishing rapport in English as a lingua franca: The case of agreement tokens. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 15(2): 58-82.

Korpela, J. (2003). English – the universal language on the Internet? Available from <http://www.cs.tut.fi/~jkorpela/lingua-franca.html>. Last accessed: 23-01-2010.

Kövecses, Z. and Szabó, P. (1996). Idioms: A view from cognitive semantics. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(3): 326-355.

Kramsch, C. (2010). Plenary speeches: The symbolic dimensions of the intercultural. *Language Teaching*, 44: 354-67.

Kramsch, C. and Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings. Towards a theory of symbolic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4): 645-71.

Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London: Routledge.

Kress, G. and van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge.

-L-

Labov, W. (1963). The social motivation of a sound change. *Word*, 19: 273-309.

_____. (1972). The logic of non-standard English. In W. Labov (ed.) *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 201-240.

Labrie, N. and Quell, C. (1997). Your language, my language, or English? The potential language choice in communication among nationals of the European Union. *World Englishes*, 16: 3-26.

Lakoff, R. (1973). *The logic of politeness; or, minding your P's and Q's*. In C. Corum, T. Cedric Smith-Stark and A. Weiser (eds) *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*. Chicago, IL: Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago, pp 292-305.

_____. (1977). What you can do with words: Politeness, pragmatics and performatives. In: R. Rogers, R. Wall and J. Murphy (eds) *Proceedings of the Texas Conference on Performatives, Presuppositions and Implicatures*, Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, pp. 79-106.

Landsberger, H.A. (1958). *Hawthorne Revisited*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). Chaos/complexity science and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(2): 141-65.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex Systems and Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lattey, E. (1986). Pragmatic classification of idioms as an aid for the language learner. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24(3): 217-233.

Lavanchy, A., Gajardo, A. and Dervin, F. (2011). Interculturality at stake. In F. Dervin, A. Gajardo and A. Lavanchy (eds) *Politics of Interculturality*. Newcastle: CSP, pp. 1-26.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

_____. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laver, J. (1975). Communicative functions of phatic communion. In A. Kendon, R. Harris and M. Key (eds) *The Organization of Behaviour in Face-to-Face Interaction*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 215-238.

LeCompte, M. and Preissle, J. (eds) (1992). *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. London: Academic Research.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.

Leung, C. (2005). Convivial communication: Recontextualizing communicative competence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2): 119-144.

_____. (2012). Outcomes-based language teaching. In A. Burns and J.C. Richards (eds) *The Cambridge Guide to Pedagogy and Practice in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 161-179.

_____. (2013). The 'social' in English language teaching: Abstracted norms versus situated enactments. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(2): 283-313.

_____. (2014). Keynote talk. *NALDIC Conference 22*. Leicester University, 22 November. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CLcvw8IJot0>. Last accessed: 29 March 2016.

_____. (2015). Why we can't predict a student's academic performance from language tests: Broadening our understanding of English at university. Annual talk, King's College London, 9 December.

Leung, C., Harris, R. and Rampton, B. (1997). The idealized native speaker, reified ethnicities and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3): 199-244.

Leung, C. and Lewkovitz, J. (2012). *Language communication and communicative competence: A view from contemporary classrooms. Language and Education*, 27(5): 398-414.

Lewicki, R.J., Bruce B., Saunders, D.M. and Minton, J.M. (2003^{4th ed.}). *Negotiation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Li, W. (1998). The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational codeswitching". In P. Auer (ed.) *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge. pp. 156-176.

_____. (2002). 'What do you want me to say?' On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society*, 31: 159-180.

Li, W. and Zhu, H. (2010). Changing hierarchies in Chinese language education for the British Chinese learners. In L. Tsung and K. Cruickshank (eds) *Teaching and Learning Chinese in Global Contexts*. London: Continuum, pp. 11-27.

Lin, A.M.Y. (2006). Beyond linguistic purism in language-in-education policy and practice: Exploring bilingual pedagogies in a Hong Kong science classroom. *Language and Education*, 20(4): 287-305.

_____. (2012). Classroom codeswitching, translanguaging and multimodal classroom practices: Integrating old and new perspectives. Seminar at King's College London, University of London, 4 May.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Cuba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Littlejohn, A. (1992). Why are English language teaching materials the way they are? PhD thesis. Lancaster University, Lancaster.

Locher, M.A. (2004). *Power and Politeness in Action. Disagreements in Oral Communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

_____. (2010). Relational work, politeness, and identity construction. In G. Antos, E. Ventola and T. Weber (eds) *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 509-540.

Locher, M.A. and Watts, R.J. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1): 9-33.

_____. (2008). Relational work and impoliteness: Negotiating norms of linguistic behaviour. In D. Bousfield and M. Locher (eds) *Impoliteness in Language. Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 77-99.

Long, M.H. (1983a). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5: 177-193.

_____. (1983b). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2): 126-141.

_____. (1983c). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. In M. Clarke and L. Handscombe (eds) *On TESOL '82. Pacific Perspectives on Language Learning and Teaching*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 207-225.

_____. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia (eds) *Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*. London: Academic Press.

Longman Learners' Corpus (LLC). Longman Corpus Network. Available from: <http://www.pearsonlongman.com/dictionaries/corpus/learners.html>. Last accessed: 30-08-2010.

Louhiala-Salminen, L. and Kankaaranta, A. (2011). Professional communication in a global business context: The notion of Global Communication Competence. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 53(3): 244-262.

Lowenberg, P. (1993). Issues of validity in tests of English as a world language: Whose standard? *World Englishes*, 12(1): 95-106.

Luke, C., de Castell, S. and Luke, A. (1989). Beyond criticism: The authority of the school textbook. In S. de Castell, A. Luke and C. Luke (eds) *Language, Authority and Criticism: Readings on the School Textbook*. London: The Falmer Press, pp. 245-260.

-M-

MacSwan, J. (2000). The architecture of the bilingual language faculty: Evidence from codeswitching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 3(1): 37-54.

Mair, C. (ed.) (2003). *The Politics of English as a World Language: New Horizons in Postcolonial Cultural Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A. (2006). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. London: Multilingual Matters.

Maley, A. (1992). An open letter to 'the profession'. *ELT Journal*, 46(1): 96-99.

Malinowski, B. (1923). The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards (eds) *The Meaning of Meaning. A Study of the Influence of Language upon, through and of the Science of Symbolism*. London: Routledge, pp. 146-152.

_____. (1947). *Freedom and Civilization*. London: G. Allen and Unwin.

_____. (1967). *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G.B. (1999^{3rd ed.}). *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Martiniello, M. (2004). How to combine integration and diversities: The challenge of an EU multicultural citizenship. Vienna: *European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia*.

Maschio, F. (2008). English as a lingua franca in the education of jurists. Paper presentation, *First International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Helsinki, 6-8 April.

Mashabela, H. (1975). unfollowed reference, in D. Crystal. (1997) *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matsumoto, D. and Hwang, H.S. (2012). Nonverbal communication: The messages of emotion, action, space, and silence. In J. Jackson (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*. London: Routledge, pp. 130-147.

Mauranen, A. (2000) Strange strings in translated language: A study on corpora. In M. Olohan (ed.) *Intercultural Faultlines. Research Models in Translation Studies. Volume 1: Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. Manchester: St. Jerome, pp. 119-141.

_____. (2006). Spoken discourse, academics and global English: A corpus perspective. In R. Hughes (ed.) *Spoken English, TESOL and Applied Linguistics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 143-158.

_____. (2007). Hybrid voices: English as the lingua franca of academics. In K. Fløttum (ed.) *Language and Discipline Perspectives on Academic Discourse*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 243-259.

_____. (2009). Introduction. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 1-7.

_____. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English Shaped by Non-Native Speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mauranen, A. and Ranta, E. (eds) (2009). *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.

McArthur, A. (1987). The English languages? *English Today*, 11: 9-13.

_____. (1998). *The English Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M. (1998). *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McClure, E. (1981). Formal and functional aspects of the code switched discourse of bilingual children. In R.P. Duran (ed.) *Latino language and communicative behavior*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 69-84.

McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McNamara, T. (2011). Managing learning: Authority and language assessment. Available from: <http://www.nus.edu.sg/celc/research/books/3rdsymposium/039to052-mcnamara.pdf>. Last accessed: 31-04-2016.

_____. (2012). English as a Lingua Franca: The challenge for language testing. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(1): 199-202.

McNamara, T. and Roever, C. (2006). *Language Testing: The Social Dimension*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.

Meierkord, C. (1996). *Englisch als Medium der Interkulturellen Kommunikation. Untersuchungen zum Non-native/Non-native Speaker Diskurs [English as a Medium of International Communication. Understanding Non-native/Non-native Speaker Discourse]*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

_____. (2002). 'Language stripped bare' or 'linguistic masala'? Culture in lingua franca conversation. In K. Knapp and C. Meierkord (eds) *Lingua Franca Communication*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 109-133.

Melchers, G. and Shaw, P. (2003). *World Englishes*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). *Case Study Research in Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Mesthrie, R. (2008). English circling the globe. *English Today*, 24(1): 28-32.

Metsä-Ketelä, M. (2006). Words are more or less superfluous: The case of *more or less* in academic lingua franca English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2): 117-143.

Mijas, R. (2011). Critical analysis of an international proficiency test – TOEFL. Available from: <http://robertmijas.com/blog/critical-analysis-of-an-international-proficiency-test-toefl/>. Last accessed: 31-06-2016.

Miles, M. and M. A. Huberman. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, J. (1984). Typicality and the case study. In R.F. Ellen (ed.) *Ethnographic Research : A Guide to Conduct*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 238-241.

Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking Culture. Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Modiano, M. (1999a). International English in the global village. *English Today*, 15(2): 22-34.

_____. (1999b). Standard Englishes and educational practices for the world's lingua franca. *English Today*, 15(4): 3-13.

Mufwene, S.S. (2001). *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murray T.R. (2003). *Blending Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods in Theses and Dissertations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Murata, K. and Jenkins, J. (2009). *Global Englishes in Asian Contexts*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Murray, H. and Dingwall, S. (2001). The dominance of English at European universities: Switzerland and Sweden compared. In U. Ammon (ed.) *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science. Effects on Other Languages and Language Communities*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 85-112.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

-N-

Nelson, C.L. (1995). Intelligibility and world Englishes in the classroom. *World Englishes*, 14(2): 273-279.

Ngũgĩ, w.a.T. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Oxford: James Currey.

Nguyen, H. (2007). Rapport building in language instruction: A microanalysis of the multiple resources in teacher talk. *Language and Education*, 21(4): 284-303.

Nisbet, J. and Watt, J. (1984). Case study. In J. Bell, T. Bush, A. Fox, J. Goodey and S. Goulding (eds) *Conducting Small-Scale Investigations in Educational Management*. London: Harper and Row, pp. 79-92.

Nunan, D. (1999/2000). "Yes, but is English?" TESOL, *Matters*: 3.

-O-

O'Connel, D.C., Kowal, S.J. and Kowal, S. (1993). Some sources of error in the transcription of real time in spoken discourse. *The Jerome Quarterly*, 8(3): 3-11.

Oda, M. (2008). English as a lingua franca or English to control: English in air traffic control. Paper presentation, *First International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Helsinki, 6-8 April.

Ogiermann, E. (2008). Politeness and in-directness across cultures: A comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian requests. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 5(2): pp. 189-216.

_____. (2009). On the culture-specificity of linguistic gender differences: The case of English and Russian apologies. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 5(3): 259-286.

Otsuji, E. and Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(3): 240-254.

Owen, J. (2005). With 20 official languages, is EU Lost in translation? Available from: http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2005/02/0222_050222_translation.html. Last accessed: 22-01-2010.

Oxford University Press. (2016). New Headway. Available from: <https://elt.oup.com/student/headway>. Last accessed: 30 March 2016.

-P-

Pakir, A. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Analyzing research frameworks in international English, world Englishes, and ELF. *World Englishes*, 28(2): 224-235.

Parkin, D. and Arnaut, K. (2014). Super-diversity and sociolinguistics – A digest. *Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies*, 95: 1-6.

Patton, M.Q. (1989^{10th ed.}). *Qualitative Evaluation Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Pavlenko, A. and Lantolf, J.P. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J.P. Lantolf (ed.) *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pennarola, C. (2013). Communication management and community-building in migrants' forums: ELF encounters on "home affairs". Paper presentation, *Sixth International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*, Roma Tre University, 4-7 September.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.

_____. (2006). *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: Routledge.

_____. (2007). The myth of English as an international language. In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (eds) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 90-115.

_____. (2009). In J. Jenkins and K. Murata (eds) *Global Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave.

Pennycook, A and Alim, S. (2007). Glocal linguistic flows: Hip-hop culture(s), identities, and the politics of language education. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 6(2): 89-100.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2007). Linguistic Imperialism: Conspiracy or conspiracy of silence? *Language Policy*, 6: 377-383.

_____. (2008). *Lingua franca* or *lingua frankensteinia*? English in European integration and globalisation. *World Englishes*, 27(2): 250-267.

_____. (2009). *Linguistic Imperialism Continued*. New York, London: Routledge.

Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D. and Linnel, J. (1996). Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 Learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(1): 59-84.

Pica, T., and Young, I. (1986). Making input comprehensible: Do interactional modifications help? *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 72: 1-25.

Pilos, S. (2005). Foreign languages in Europe's schools. Large differences in age of starting first foreign language. *Eurostat*, news release 53/2001: 1-5. Available from: <http://www.mic.org.mt/pR's/eurostat/no532001.htm>. Last accessed: 01-10-2007.

Pinca, A. (ed.) (1995). *Spreading English: ELT Projects in International Development*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Phoenix ELT.

Pitzl, L.-M. (2009). "We should not wake up any dogs": Idiom and metaphor in ELF. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 298-322.

_____. (2012). Creativity meets convention: Idiom variation and re-metaphorization in ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(1): 27-55.

Pitzl, M.-L., Breiteneder, A. and Klimpfinger, T. (2008). A world of words: Processes of lexical innovation in VOICE. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 17(2): 21-46. Available from: <http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/Views0802.pdf>. Last accessed: 15-04-2009.

Platt, J., Weber, H. and Ho, M.L. (1984). *The New Englishes*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Pölzl, U. (2003). Signalling cultural identity: The use of L1/Ln in ELF. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 12: 3-23.

Poplack, S. (1980). "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en Español": Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18(7/8): 581-618.

_____. (1983). Bilingual competence: Linguistic interference or grammatical integrity? In L. Elias-Olivares (ed.) *Spanish in the U.S. Setting: Beyond the Southwest*. Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, pp. 107-131.

Powney, J. and Watts, M. (1987). *Interviewing in Educational Research*. London: Routledge.

Preisler, B. (1999). Function and forms of English in a European ELF country. In T. Bex and R.J. Watts (eds) *Standard English: The Widening Debate*. London: Routledge, pp. 239-267.

Prodromou, L. (1992). What culture? Which culture? Cross-cultural factors in language learning. *ELT Journal*, 46(1): 39-50.

_____. (1997). From corpus to octopus. *IATEFL, Newsletter*, 137: 18-21.

Pullin, P. (2009). No joke – this is serious! Power, solidarity and humour in business English as a lingua franca (BELF). In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 152-177.

_____. (2010). Small talk, rapport, and international communicative competence. *Journal of Business Communication*, 47(4): 455-476.

_____. (2011). Achieving “comity”: An exploration of the use of stance markers and facework in English as a lingua franca (ELF) interaction. Paper presentation, *Fourth International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*, Hong Kong Institute of Education, 26-28 May.

_____. (2013). Achieving “comity”: The role of linguistic stance in business English as a lingua franca (BELF) meetings. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(1): 1-23.

-Q-

Quirk, R. (1985). The English language in a global context. In R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (eds) *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and the Literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1988). The question of standards in the international use of English. In P. Lowenberg (ed.) *Language Spread and Language Policy: Issues, Implications and Case Studies*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

_____. (1990). *English in Use*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

-R-

Rampton, B. (1990). Displacing the “native speaker”: Expertise, affiliation and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44(2): 97-101.

_____. (1995). *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*. London and New York: Longman.

Rampton, B., Blommaert, J., Arnaut, K. and Spotti, M. (2015). Superdiversity and sociolinguistics. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, 152: 1-13. Available from: https://www.academia.edu/10709535/WP152_Rampton_Blommaert_Arnaut_and_Spotti_2015_Superdiversity_and_sociolinguistics. Last accessed: 01-04-2016.

Rampton, B., Tusting, K., Maybin, J., Barwell, R., Creese, A. and Lytra, V. (2004). UK linguistic ethnography: A discussion paper. Available from <http://www.ling-ethnog.org.uk/documents/papers/ramptonetal2004.pdf>. Last accessed: 01-09-2010.

Ranta, E. (2006). The 'attractive' progressive – Why use the *-ing* form in English as a lingua franca? *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2): 95-116.

_____. (2009). Syntactic features in spoken ELF – Learner language or spoken grammar? In A. Maurannen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

_____. (2010). Models for English grammar at school. Plenary presentation, *Third International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Vienna, 22-25 May.

Richards, J.C. (1993). Beyond the text book: The role of commercial materials in language teaching. *RELC Journal*, 24(1): 1-14.

Richards, J.C. and Rogers, T.S. (2014^{3rd.}). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richardson, L. (2000). Evaluating *ethnography*. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6(2): 253-255.

Riekkinen, N. (2010). "This is not a criticism, but..." – Softening criticism: The use of lexical hedges in academic spoken interaction. *English as a Lingua Franca*, special issue of *Helsinki English Studies*, 6: 75-87.

Roberts, C., Byram, M., Barro, A., Jordan, S. and Street, B. (2001). *Language Learners as Ethnographers*. Clavedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rymes, B. (2014). Communicative repertoire. In B. Street and C. Leung (eds) *Routledge Companion to English Language Studies*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 287-301.

-S-

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, A. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50: 696-735.

Saraceni, M. (2008). English as a lingua franca: Between form and function. *English Today*, 24(2): 20-26.

Savignon, S.J. (1972). *Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching*. Philadelphia, PA: The Centre for Curriculum Development.

Scarino, A. (2005). *Learning languages in the New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington: New Zealand Ministry of Education. Available from: <http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Curriculum-resources/NZC-resource-bank/Learning-languages/Supporting-materials#resource-1139>. Last accessed 29 March 2016.

Schegloff, E.A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden and D.H. Zimmerman (eds) *Talk and Social Structure*. Oxford: Polity Press, pp. 44-70.

_____. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis. Volume I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organisation of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53: 361-382.

Schegloff, E.A. and Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8: 289-327.

Schenk, E.A. (1978). *A Guide to Identifying High Graduation Competencies*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schneider, E. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties Around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R. (1996). Discourse identity, social identity, and confusion in intercultural communication. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 6(1): 1-16.

Scollon, R. and Scollon, S.W. (1995). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

_____. (2001^{2nd ed.}). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.

Scollon, R., Scollon, S.W. and Jones, R.H. (2012^{3rd ed.}). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. Sussex: Willey-Blackwell.

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in society*, 5(1): 1-23.

Sebba, M. (1997). *Contact Languages: Pidgins and Creoles*. London: Macmillan.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2): 133-158.

_____. (2002). *Habeas corpus and divide et impera*: “Global English” and applied linguistics. In K. Spelman Miller and P. Thomson (eds) *Unity and Diversity in Language Use*. London: Continuum.

_____. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24: 209-239.

_____. (2006). English as a Lingua Franca in the expanding circle: What it isn't. In R. Rudby and M. Saraceni (eds) *English in the World*. London: Continuum, pp. 40-50.

_____. (2007). English as a lingua franca and communities of practice. In S. Volk-Birke and J. Lippert (eds) *Anglistentag 2006 Halle Proceedings*. Trier, Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, pp. 307-318.

_____. (2009a). Orientation in ELF research: Form and function. In A. Mauranen and E. Ranta (eds) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 37-59.

_____. (2009b). Accommodation and the idiom principle in English as a lingua franca. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2): 195-215.

_____. (2009c). Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *World Englishes*, 28(2): 236-245.

Seidlhofer, B., Breiteneder, A. and Pitzl, M.-L. (2006). English as a lingua franca in Europe: Challenges for applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26: 3-34.

Seidlhofer, B. and Widdowson, H.G. (2007). Idiomatic variation and change in English. The idiom principle and its realizations. In U. Smit, S. Dollinger, J. Hüttner, G. Kaltenböck and U. Lutzky (eds) *Tracing English through Time. Explorations in Language Variation*. Vienna: Braumüller, pp. 359-374.

Shannon, P. (1987). Commercial reading materials, a technological ideology, and the deskilling of teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 87(3): 307-329.

Shohamy, E. (2001). *The Power of Tests: A Critical Perspective on the Uses of Language Tests*. London: Pearson.

_____. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. Abingdon, UK and New York: Routledge.

Sifakis, N., Lytra, V. and Fay, R. (2010). English as a lingua franca in an increasingly post-EFL era: The case of English in the Greek state education curriculum. Paper presentation, *Third International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Vienna, 22-25 May.

Silverman, D. (2001^{2nd ed.}). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods of Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London: Sage Publications.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. and Phillipson, R. (1998). Linguicide. In J.L. Mey (ed.) *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 506-507.

Smith, L.E. (1976). English as an international auxiliary language. *RELC Journal*, 7(2): 38-42.

_____. (ed.) (1983). *Readings in English as an International Language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Soars, L. and Soars, J. (2009^{4th ed.}). *New Headway – Intermediate Student's Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2011^{4th ed.}). *New Headway – Elementary Student's Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Speake, J. (ed.) (2000). *Oxford Dictionary of Idioms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2002). Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(5): 529-545.

Spencer-Oatey, H. and Franklin, P. (2009). *Intercultural Interaction. A Multidisciplinary Approach to Intercultural Communication*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stake, R.E. (1994). Identification of the case. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, pp. 236-247.

Standard Speaking Test Corpus (SST Corpus). Available from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.1.20.5827>. Last accessed: 03-10-2010.

Strang, B. (1970). *A History of English*. London: Routledge.

Strauss, A.L. (1987). *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strevens, P. (1980). *Teaching English as an International Language: From Practice to Principle*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Sturman A. (1999). Case study methods. In J.P. Keeves and G. Lakomski (eds) *Issues in Educational Research*. Oxford: Elsevier Science, pp. 103-112.

Sung, C.C.M. (2011). English, accent, and identity: A case study of Hong Kong university students. Paper presentation, *Fourth International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Hong Kong, 26-28 May.

Swan, M. (2006). Chunks in the classroom: Let's not go overboard. *Teacher Trainer*, 20(3): 5-6.

Sweeney, S. (2008). English, globalisation and the cultural dimension. Plenary presentation, *GlobEng: International Conference on Global English*. University of Verona, 14-16 February.

-T-

Tannen, D. (1984a). *Conversational Style. Analyzing Talk Among Friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

_____. (1984b). The pragmatics of cross-cultural communication. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3): 189-195.

Taylor, L. (2002). Assessing learners' English: But whose/which English(es)? University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations, *Research Notes*, 10: 18-20.

Todd, L. (1990^{2nd ed.}). *Pidgins and Creoles*. London: Routledge.

Toolan, M. (1997). Recentring English: New English and global. *English Today*, 13(4): 3-10.

Tosi, A. (ed.) (2003). *Crossing Barriers and Bridging Cultures. The Challenges of Multilingual Translation for the European Union*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

_____. (2005). EU translation problems and the danger of linguistic devaluation. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15: 384-388.

Trim, J.L.M. (2011a). Preface. In Green, A. *Language Functions Revisited: Theoretical and Empirical Bases for Language Construct Definition across the Ability Range*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. xxi-xxxiv.

_____. (2011b). Interview. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tqavFTIZMhY>. Last accessed: 29 March 2016.

Tripathi, P. (1998). Redefining Kachru's "Outer Circle" of English. *English Today*, 13(4): 3-10.

Truchot, C. (1997). The spread of English: From France to a more general perspective. *World Englishes*, 16(1): 65-76.

_____. (2002). Key aspects of the use of English in Europe. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Available from: http://www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Cooperation/education/Languages/Language_Policy/Policy_development_activities/Studies/TruchotEN.pdf. Last accessed: 01-10-2012.

_____. (2003). Some facts and some questions on the use of English in the workplace. In R. Ahrens (ed.) *Europäische Sprachenpolitik [European Language Policy]*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, pp. 303-310.

Trudgill, P.J. (1974). Linguistic change and diffusion: Description and explanation in sociolinguistic dialect geography. *Language in Society*, 3: 215-246.

Trudgill, P.J. and Hannah, J. (1985). *International English: A Guide to Varieties of Standard English*. London: Edward Arnold.

Tübingen English as a Lingua Franca Corpus (TELF). Available from: www.ael.uni-tuebingen.de/projects/TELF.html. Last accessed: 02-10-2010.

-U-

Usami, N. (1993). Politeness in Japanese dyadic conversations between unacquainted people: The influence of power asymmetry. Paper presentation, *The 10th World Congress of Applied Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Netherlands.

-V-

Van der Aa, J. and Blommaert, J. (2011). *Ethnographic monitoring. Hymes' unfinished business in educational research*. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 42(4): 319-333.

van Ek, J.A. (1977). *The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning in Schools*. London: Longman.

van Ek, J.A. and Trim, J.L.M. (1991a). *Threshold Level 1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1991b). *Waystage 1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1997). *Vantage Level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

van Els, T. (2005). Multilingualism in the European Union. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3): 263-281.

van Leeuwen, T. (2005). *Introducing Social Semiotics*. London: Routledge.

van Leeuwen, T. and Jewitt, C. (eds) (2001). *A Handbook of Visual Analysis*. London: Sage.

Van Rooy, B. (2010). Social and linguistic perspectives on variability in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 29(1): 3-20.

Varonis, E.M. and Gass, S.M. (1982). The comprehensibility of non-native speech. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 4: 114-136.

_____. (1985a). Miscommunication in native/non-native conversation. *Language in Society*, 14: 327-343.

_____. (1985b). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(1): 71-90.

Vega, G. (1990). *Humor competence: The fifth component*. Paper presentation, 24th Annual Meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Francisco, CA, 6-10 March.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6): 1024-1054.

Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE). Available from: <https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/corpus>. Last accessed: 31-10-2009.

Viereck, W. (1996). English in Europe. Its nativisation and use as a lingua franca, with special reference to German-speaking countries. In R. Hartmann (ed.) *The English Language in Europe*. Oxford: Intellect, pp. 16-23.

Vogt, H. (1954). Review of 'Languages in Contact'. *Word*, 10: 79-82.

-W-

Walker, R. (2010). *Teaching the Pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wang, Y. (2013). Non-conformity to ENL norms: A perspective from Chinese English users. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(2): 255-282.

Wastiau-Schlüter, P. (2005). Foreign language learning: A European priority. Eurydice in brief. Available from: http://www.eurydice.org/Documents/Eurydice_en_bref/EN/4_pages_langue_EN.pdf. Last accessed: 01-10-2007.

Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H. and Jackson, D. (1967). *Pragmatics of Human Communication*. New York: Norton.

Weber, M. (2011 [1949]). *Methodology of Social Sciences*. (Trans.: E.A. Shils). New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction Publishers. (Original publication: New York: Free Press).

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Werning, M., Machery, E. and Schurz, G. (eds) (2005). *The Compositionality of Meaning and Content. Volume I: Foundational Issues*. Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag.

Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2): 377-389.

_____. (1998). The conditions of contextual meaning. In K. Malmkjaer and J. Williams (eds) *Learning and Language Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2003). *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2010). closing remarks, Sociolinguistics colloquium, *3rd International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*. University of Vienna, 22-25 May.

Wilkins, D.A. (1972). *Linguistics in Language Teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.

Williams, C. 1994. Arfaniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destum addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog [An evaluation of teaching and learning methodologies in the bilingual secondary education context]. PhD thesis. University of Bangor.

Wolcott, H. (1994). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis and Interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wolfartsberger, A. (2011). ELF business/business ELF: Form and function in simultaneous speech. In A. Archibald, A. Cogo. and J. Jenkins (eds) *Latest Trends in ELF Research*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 169-183.

Woods, P. (1992). Symbolic interactionism: Theory and method. In M. LeCompte and Preissle (eds) *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. London: Academic Research, pp. 337-404.

Wray, A. (2008). *Formulaic Language: Pushing the Boundaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-Y-

Yano, Y. (2007). English as an international language: Its past, present and future. In M. Nakano (ed.) *On-Demand Internet Course Book: World Englishes and Communications*. Tokyo: Waseda University International, pp. 27-42.

Yin, R.K. (1994^{2nd ed.}). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

-Z-

Zentella, A.C. (1997). *Growing up Bilingual*. Maiden, MA: Blackwell.

Zhu, H. (2014). *Exploring Intercultural Communication: Language in Action*. London: Routledge.

_____. (2015). Negotiation as the way of engagement in intercultural and lingua franca communication: Frame of reference and interculturality. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(1): 63-90.

Zoghbor, W. (2009). The implications of the LFC for the Arab context. *IATEFL, Pronunciation Special Interest Group Newsletter*, 41: 25-29.

Zimmerman, D.H. (1998). Discourse Identities and Social Identities. In C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (eds) *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage, pp. 87-106.

APPENDIX 1.

Abbreviations list

ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BAAL	British Association of Applied Linguistics
BELF	Business English as a Lingua Franca
BERA	British Educational Research Association
BSA	British Sociological Association
CA	Conversation Analysis
CBE	Competency-Based Education
CBLT	Competency-Based Language Teaching
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference for Languages
CLEC	Chinese Learner English Corpus
CLC	Cambridge Learner Corpus
CLIL	Content and Language Integrated Learning
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
CLIL	Content and Language Integrated Learning
CoP	Community of Practice
DIALANG	Diagnostic Language Assessment System
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EIL	English as an International Language
ELF	English as a Lingua Franca
ELFA	English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings Corpus
ELFIA	English as a Lingua Franca In Asia Corpus
ELT	English Language Teaching
ENL	English as a Native Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
ETS	Educational Testing Service
GCC	Global Communicative Competence
HKUST	Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Corpus of Learner English
ICC	Intercultural Communicative Competence
ICLE	International Corpus of Learner English
IELTS	International English Language Testing System
JLEC	Japanese Learner of English Corpus

L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
LFC	Lingua Franca Core
LFG	Lexical Functional Grammar
Ln	'Any' Language
LLC	Longman Learners' Corpus
MICASE	Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English
ML	Mother Language
MT	Mother Tongue
NALDIC	National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum
NES	Native English Speaker
NNES	Non-Native English Speaker
NNS	Non-Native Speaker
NS	Native Speaker
S1	First Speaker
S2	Second Speaker
SELF	Studying in English as a Lingua Franca Corpus
SFL	Systemic Functional Linguistics
SSTC	Standard Speaking Test Corpus
SFLT	Systemic Functional Linguistics Theory
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
TELF	Tübingen English as a Lingua Franca Corpus
TL	Target Language
TOEFL	Test Of English as a Foreign Language
VOICE	Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English
WE	World Englishes
NB.	Only the abbreviations which featured in the main body of this thesis are included here. Abbreviations which appeared in the transcribed extracts of the meetings of the students or in the post-session interviews which I had with them, such as the names of their colleges (e.g. LSE, UCL KCL), are not included here.

APPENDIX 2.

Transcription conventions list

Transcription conventions and examples from the data	Explanation
Focus:	
Bold text	
10 Linlin oh (.) hold zhu (.)	Each extract was focusing on a particular word or phrase or expression. Each time, these were provided in bold, not only in order to help the reader track them more easily, but also thus in order to facilitate my analysis of this stretch of discourse.
Lines:	
Numbering and breaking	
17 Arvin relax (.) 18 you'll find a way 15 Breno hm? 16 Jose what? 30 Eshal ah 31 (1.3) 32 Linlin i mean ok	Each line represented a breath group. Each line was also numbered, and the name of the attributed speaker was provided too. In case more than one line had speech from the same speaker, the speaker's name was not provided again. When there was a pause between two different speakers, the pause was allocated to a different line, as it is explained below too.
Participants' identity:	
Pseudonyms	
1 Linlin	Participants' names were pseudonymised. In particular, each pseudonym was chosen to reflect the gender and the linguistic identity of the participant. For example, for me (Vasileios, male, having Greek as my L1 and Greece as my country of origin), I would have chosen another Greek man's name ideally with the same initial too (e.g. Vaggelis).
16 Arvin <Marat>, I noticed you swore bloody hell or bloody in your accent?	As mentioned above, the participants' names were pseudonymised, and their pseudonyms were provided in the attributed speaker's column on the left side outside the transcribed speech to indicate who was talking each time. However, in the transcribed speech, when there was reference to the participants' names, since

	this would be their real name, their real name was also pseudonymised and this pseudonym was put in angle brackets to indicate that in this case this was not what a speaker had actually said.
Spelling:	
Capitalisations	
1 Arvin and i think then (.) <Marat> should be the officer of LSE	Although spelling and other orthographic conventions were relatively relaxed, as it was explained before, capitalisation was kept in two cases. First, in the speakers' pseudonyms, both in the left column with the name of the speakers and also in the transcribed speech. Second, in the abbreviation of the colleges which the students were referring to. This is so, because it was felt that they would offer an immediate understanding of the person or the college referred to, and thus the analytical procedure would be facilitated.
Content:	
Repetitions	
30 Shivani why why are you laughing at my idea?	All repetitions of syllables, words, and so on, were included in the transcription. These repetitions were found to be very important too, as many times they signalled hesitation or uncertainty on the part of the speakers to express their ideas.
Truncations	
13 Marat [bloody he- bloody bl- bl- blin ↑]	Truncated speech was marked with a hyphen. The ensuing speech was sometimes the continuation of the previous word, but sometimes it was the start of a new one. However, because of the lack of straightforward correspondence between the graphemic and the phonetic elements of the English language, it was sometimes difficult to use the hyphen to show where exactly the speech was truncated, e.g. in the example of the word 'i'. At the extent that this was important for the analytical purposes of each extract, due reference was made each time.
58 Ales yeah it was i- i- you know	
Lengthenings	
25 Breno coo::l↑	A colon was used after the last letter of a syllable in a word-medial position or a word-

19 Breno	have a merry vacations?	final position to represent some kind of lengthening of this phoneme. The amount of colons used were supposed to represent as much length as that phoneme would need to be uttered. For example, in the example here featuring 'coo::l', there are three colons, as over this amount of time three /u/ would have been uttered.
20 Eshal	no::	
Turn-taking:		
Latching speech		
4 Linlin	and they're they're bad with what they're doing=	The equality sign was used to represent instances when a speaker's utterance was latched by another speaker's utterance, whether that was a case of sentence completion or taking the floor more quickly, or even stealing the floor. In that sense, the latching indicated that the time which was passing in between two speaker's utterances was shorter than what the regular one would be, in which case no equality sign was used.
5 Eshal	=yeah you're right	
21 Halim	oh because in nigeria we say flash =	
22 Ales	= because [it flashes]	
Overlapping speech		
36 Sener	=[oh cool↑↑]	For the overlapping speech, square brackets were used. The start of the first bracket and the end of the last square bracket each time were showing where this overlapping speech was starting and ending respectively, even if some syllables or laughters were left out. This speech was usually between two speakers, but sometimes between more than two as well.
37 Shivani	[impress]ive↑	
15 Linlin	[ha]ha	
16 Jose	[so]	
17 Breno	[and]	
18 Marat	[ok]	
Intonation:		
Questions		
46 Marat	so (.) is it hahaha xie xie?	A question mark was used to refer to intonation which signalled a question.
Emphases		
20 Halim	=[WAIT↑] wait wait	Words which were provided in capital letters represented prominence usually due to speakers' raised voice or shouting.
32 Linlin	<u>diaosi</u> and nothing else	Words which were underlined showed that the speakers uttered them with some sort of emphasis.
39 Linlin	thanks↑	A single upward arrow at the end of a word was used to represent intonation which signalled some kind of enthusiasm regarding the respective word.

69 Shivani	↑can't agree more with you guys↑	Two upward arrows, the first one in the beginning of a word and the second one at the end of the same word or another word, were used to represent intonation which was actually signalling some kind of enthusiasm regarding the entire stretch which they encompassed.
Pauses:		
Short pauses		
1 Leonidas	you know, everyone should be entertained and enjoyed, right?	To represent short pauses, the use of commas was kept in specific instances, such as in sentence initial or sentence final discourse markers, tag tail questions, and vocatives. This was so, because it was felt that they facilitate or even ensure a better understanding of the utterance rather than hindering it.
46 Leonidas	(hahaha-)thank you really very much, guys(-)	
Medium pauses		
1 Linlin	well (.) for me the officer of a college is (.) like (1.2)	Full stops were not omitted. They were used in square brackets in order to represent medium pauses, that is, pauses which were not as short as the ones which were represented with commas, but not as long as the ones which were represented with square brackets including their duration. The use of full stops for the purposes of these transcriptions would sometimes coincide with the use of full stops in regular texts.
2	is like a representative there (.)	
Long pauses		
16 Linlin	i i (1.3) i was bringing the soy sauce haha	For pauses over a period of time longer than what a regular comma would represent, their duration was provided, in round brackets. This was important for analytical purposes, in so far as it was found that the longer the pause the more intensified their function was, such as showing hesitation or uncertainty of what to say and so on. The decimal notation featured only 1 decimal number, which was deemed sufficient for the analytical purposes of this study. When there was a pause between two different speakers, the pause was allocated to a different line, as it was explained earlier too.
20 Halim	=[WAIT↑] wait wait	
21 Breno	[but]	
22	(3.7)	
23 Halim	look, <Leonidas>	

Clarity:		
Uncertain speech		
14 Shivani	or goes with (erasmus) to another university	The instances of uncertain speech were relatively few. This was due to many factors. For example, the audio-recordings were taking place in relatively quiet places, there were a few people in each meeting, and the meetings were usually very orderly. Also, I met with a lot of the students later on for our post-event discussions and each time I was taking the opportunity to ask them to clarify what they had said, in case I was not able to extrapolate it myself. In the relatively few cases that uncertain talk was found, it was provided according to what perhaps sounded to be the case and it was put in round brackets.
Incomprehensible speech		
53 Marat	yeap like me from russia (xxx)	The instances of incomprehensible speech were also relatively few, for the same reasons which were mentioned in the case of uncertain talk above too. This incomprehensible speech was put in round brackets, but this time it was represented with xxx. The amount of x's were tried to correspond to the amount of syllables of the incomprehensible talk. Sometimes this was possible, but sometimes it was not, because there was a sudden burst of noise which was covering everything for a while. In these cases, the amount of x's was chosen by approximation to correspond to the syllables which would be uttered, considering the rate of delivery of that particular speaker in that particular interactional moment.
Additional information:		
Paralinguistic information		
20 Arvin	=(singing the way the soundtrack goes-)wanna be my chamak chalo oh oh oh oh(-)	Round brackets were used to provide description of various paralinguistic features when the subsequent utterance was delivered in a varied way. Each time there were two sets of round brackets. The first one included the actual description with the paralinguistic features of the varied speech and also a hyphen to signal its start, and the second set of round brackets included only a hyphen to signal its end. In the case of
13 Eshal	=(angry-)why are you laughing?(-)	
46 Leonidas	=(hahaha-)thank	

<p>you very much, guys(-)</p>	<p>laughters, the laughter syllables were represented with the respective number of 'ha' or 'he' according to the situation. Laughters were included in this category, when they showed that the subsequent speech was uttered in a laughing manner too. However, in some cases, most notably in the case of utterances while speakers were laughing, there was not any clear start and end point, as each time the varied manner of speech was rather starting gradually and was ending gradually too. This was not deemed to be significant considering the analytical purposes of the extracts.</p>
<p>Contextual information:</p>	
<p>Extralinguistic information</p>	
<p>6 Elvira thanks 7 (3.4 [turning some pages])</p> <p>16 Leonidas [takes out his smartphone and tries to look this word up*]</p> <p>17 Arvin ok ↑ 18 but seriously it's fine you don't have to do that=</p> <p>19 Leonidas =eeeh give me one second please because 20 because this greek word in english 21 found it 22 it says it's like high spirits and good mood or joy in English[*]</p>	<p>Square brackets were used to provide description of extralinguistic information or other contextual information which was not linguistically encoded but was important all the same, such as facial expressions, hand gestures, bodily movements, etc. Sometimes, the square brackets were put within round brackets next to the amount of seconds that their respective action lasted, in case nothing was being uttered. Or there were mentioned independently followed by an asterisk to indicate when their respective action started, while an asterisk in square brackets later on also indicated when their respective action ended. The end was either within the same line or sometimes later on. In any case, it was considered for the contextual information to be included in the transcriptions. This was so, because all these were considered to be part of the overall meaning-making process by modifying the propositions which were linguistically encoded by the students. Although these students were present in the meetings which I attended and audio-recorded, not all their actions surrounding their utterances found their way in the transcribed extracts. The reason behind this was that I was trying to take notes and include only the extralinguistic features and</p>

	contextual information which at that point I considered important for the subsequent analytical purposes of my study, and not all of them.
--	--

APPENDIX 3.

Participants' profile

	Participants	Gender	Country of domicile	Nationality/ies	L1
1	Ales	<i>m.</i>	Slovakia	Slovakian	Slovakian
2	Arvin	<i>m.</i>	Mauritius	Mauritian	Mauritian Creole
3	Breno	<i>m.</i>	Brazil	Brazilian/ Belgian	Portuguese
4	Donatella	<i>f.</i>	Italy	Italian	Italian
5	Elvira	<i>f.</i>	Spain	Spanish	Spanish
6	Eshal	<i>f.</i>	Pakistan	Pakistani	Urdu
7	Frieda	<i>f.</i>	Germany	German	German
8	Halim	<i>m.</i>	Nigeria	Palestinian	Arabic
9	Jose	<i>m.</i>	Colombia	Colombian	Spanish
10	Leonidas	<i>m.</i>	Greece	Greek	Greek
11	Linlin	<i>f.</i>	China	Chinese	Mandarin Chinese
12	Marat	<i>f.</i>	Russia	Russian	Russian
13	Sener	<i>m.</i>	Turkey	Turkish	Turkish
14	Shivani	<i>f.</i>	India	Indian	Hindi
15	Winnie	<i>f.</i>	Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Cantonese Chinese
NB.	<p>All the participants' names are pseudonyms to ensure anonymity.</p> <p>'Country of domicile', refers here to the country where the students used to live before coming to London for their studies. It was considered a term more suitable than 'country of origin' or 'country of birth', as some of the students had lived in more than one country before, and there were also cases where students had spent only a very limited time in the country in which they were born and this was only in the very early years of their lives.</p> <p>Only the students' information which was considered useful for the analytical purposes of this study were included in the participants' profile above. Thus, characteristics or other pieces of information such as their college, course, age, and so on, were not included here.</p> <p>This is a list with the students who feature in the extracts which were analysed in the chapters of this thesis, and some of them were also participated in the post-meeting interviews too. The students who</p>				

	participated in the study but did not feature in the extracts or in the interviews which were analysed here were not included in the participants' profile list above.
--	--

APPENDIX 4.

Naturally occurring spoken discourse outline

Chapter 4: Making specific meaning through translanguaging in ELF conversations	
Extract	4.3.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Making specific meaning</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Filling in a lexical gap</i>
Analytical focus / Romanised script (pinyin)	Diaosi
Original script (hanzi)	吊丝
Language of origin	Mandarin Chinese
Approximate meaning	Average person, commoner
Length	283 words
Lines	42
Students' meeting	2 nd
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Breno - Portuguese Eshal - Urdu Jose - Spanish Linlin - Mandarin Chinese
Extract	4.3.2
Pragmatic function	<i>Making specific meaning</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Filling in a lexical gap</i>
Analytical focus / Romanised script (English and pinyin)	Hold zhu
Original script (English and hanzi)	<i>Hold</i> 住
Language of origin	Mandarin Chinese
Approximate meaning	Stay strong, keep your composure
Length	183 words
Lines	28
Students' meeting	2 nd
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Eshal - Urdu Linlin - Mandarin Chinese
Extract	4.3.3
Pragmatic function	<i>Making specific meaning</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Filling in a lexical gap</i>
Analytical focus / Original script	Çok sert

Language of origin	Turkish
Literal meaning	Very hard
Approximate meaning	Very successful
Length	246 words
Lines	28
Students' meeting	3 rd
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Leonidas - Greek Sener - Turkish
Extract	4.3.4
Pragmatic function	<i>Making specific meaning</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Filling in a lexical gap</i>
Analytical focus / Romanised script	Chamak chalo
Original script	चमक चल
Language of origin	Hindi
Literal meaning	Item girl
Approximate meaning	Favourite girl, girlfriend
Length	257 words
Lines	30
Students' meeting	2 nd
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Eshal - Urdu Jose - Spanish
Extract	4.4.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Making specific meaning</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Using some more precise lexis</i>
Analytical focus / Romanised script	Kefi
Original script	Κέφι
Language of origin	Greek
Approximate meaning	High spirits, good mood, joy
Length	428 words
Lines	46
Students' meeting	3 rd
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Jose - Spanish Leonidas - Greek Sener - Turkish
Extract	4.4.2
Pragmatic function	<i>Making specific meaning</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Using some more precise lexis</i>
Analytical focus	One bell and flash

Language / city/country of origin	English / Birmingham - English / Nigeria
Meaning	Give someone a missed call
Length	163 words
Lines	27
Students' meeting	1 st
Participants - L1	Ales - Slovakian Arvin - Mauritian Creole Halim - Arabic
Chapter 5: Achieving politeness in ELF discussions	
Extract	5.3.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Achieving politeness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English</i>
Analytical focus	I have seeds
Original script (hanzi)	有种
Romanised script (pinyin)	You zhong
Language of origin	Mandarin Chinese
Approximate meaning	I have balls, I have courage
Length	314 words
Lines	36
Students' meeting	2 nd
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Jose - Spanish Linlin - Mandarin Chinese
Extract	5.3.2
Pragmatic function	<i>Achieving politeness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English</i>
Analytical focus / Romanised script	Blin
Original script	Блин
Language of origin	Russian
Literal meaning	Pancake
Additional meaning	Prostitute
Length	450 words
Lines	56
Students' meeting	2 nd
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Eshal - Urdu Jose - Spanish Marat - Russian

Extract	5.3.3
Pragmatic function	<i>Achieving politeness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English</i>
Analytical focus	Madar chod
Language of origin	Hindi
Original script	माँ कमीने'
Meaning	Mother fucker
Length	434 words
Lines	57
Students' meeting	2 nd
Participants - L1	Eshal - Urdu Jose - Spanish Breno - Portuguese
Extract	5.4.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Achieving politeness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background</i>
Analytical focus	Spacibo - xie xie (pinyin)
Languages of origin	Russian - Mandarin Chinese
Original script	Спасибо - 谢谢 (hanzi)
Meaning	Thank you
Length	338 words
Lines	49
Students' meeting	2 nd
Students - L1	Breno - Portuguese Jose - Spanish Linlin - Mandarin Chinese Marat - Russian
Chapter 6: Maintaining cultural appropriateness by means of negotiation in ELF interactions	
Extract	6.3.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Maintaining cultural appropriateness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Refining the culturally contested elements of an expression</i>
Analytical focus	All the goods of Abraham
Original script	Όλα τα καλά του Αβραάμ
Romanised script	Ola ta kala tou Avraam
Language of origin	Greek
Meaning	All the goods that someone can provide

Refined as	All the goods of all the saints, all the goods under the sun
Length	340 words
Lines	51
Students' meeting	4 th
Students - L1	Breno - Portuguese Halim - Arabic Leonidas - Greek
Extract	6.3.2
Pragmatic function	<i>Maintaining cultural appropriateness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Refining the culturally contested elements of an expression</i>
Analytical focus	Bringing home the bacon
Meaning	Supply someone, provide support to someone
Refined as	Bringing home some other kind of meat, bringing home whatever food is allowed, bringing home what we need
Length	602 words
Lines	72
Students' meeting	5 th
Students - L1	Ales - Slovakian Arvin - Mauritian Creole Eshal - Urdu Frieda - German Marat - Russian
Extract	6.3.3
Pragmatic function	<i>Maintaining cultural appropriateness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Refining the culturally contested elements of an expression</i>
Analytical focus	Hit the bull's eye
Meaning	Be spot on, achieve the goal perfectly
Refined as	Hit the right target, hit in the right way, do it in the right way
Length	546 words
Lines	70
Students' meeting	4 th
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Breno - Portuguese Halim - Arabic Shivani - Hindu
Extract	6.4.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Maintaining cultural appropriateness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Replacing the culturally contested expression altogether</i>

Analytical focus	Too many chiefs and not enough Indians
Meaning	Too many leaders and not enough people to be led
Replaced with	Not enough positions for everyone, not everyone can get what they want
Length	346 words
Lines	45
Students' meeting	5 th
Students - L1	Breno - Portuguese Eshal - Urdu Leonidas - Greek Marat - Russian Shivani - Hindi
Extract	6.4.2
Pragmatic function	<i>Maintaining cultural appropriateness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Refining the culturally contested elements of an expression</i>
Analytical focus	Merry Christmas
Refined as	Merry vacations, merry holidays, have a nice winter break
Length	140 words
Lines	27
Students' meeting	5 th
Students - L1	Breno - Portuguese Eshal - Urdu
Chapter 7: Managing the relational in ELF contexts	
Extract	7.3.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Managing the relational and building rapport</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group</i>
Analytical focus	I was bringing the soy sauce
Language of origin	Mandarin Chinese
Original script (hanzi)	打酱油
Romanised script (pinyin)	Da jiang you
Actual meaning	I was helping only with minor tasks
Revised as	I was bringing the tea bags, I was bringing the beer bottles, I will bring the naan bread, I'll go bring the papayas and the guavas fruits
Length	449 words
Lines	54
Students' meeting	2 nd
Students - L1	Breno - Portuguese

	Eshal - Urdu Linlin - Mandarin Chinese Winnie - Cantonese Chinese
Extract	7.3.2
Pragmatic function	<i>Managing the relational and building rapport</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group</i>
Analytical focus	I've crossed the Rubicon River
Meaning	I've taken the irrevocable decision to do something although I know that it entails difficulties
Revised as	I've crossed the Moskva River, I've crossed the Amazon River, I've crossed the Yangtze River, I've crossed the Thames
Length	508 words
Lines	64
Students' meeting	3 rd
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Donatella - Italian Jose - Portuguese Linlin - Mandarin Chinese Marat - Russian
Extract	7.3.3
Pragmatic function	<i>Managing the relational and building rapport</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group</i>
Analytical focus	Himalayan blunder
Language / country of origin	English / India
Actual meaning	Very big mistake
Revised as	Blunder as high as Mound Tai, blunder from the Highlands
Length	448 words
Lines	62
Students' meeting	2 nd
Students - L1	Linlin - Mandarin Chinese Marat - Russian Sener - Turkish Shivani - Hindi
Extract	7.3.4
Pragmatic function	<i>Managing the relational and building rapport</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group</i>
Analytical focus	From Guatemala to Guatepeor

Language of origin	Spanish
Original script	Saliste de Guatemala y te metiste en Guatapeor
Literal meaning	You left Guate-bad and you ended up in Guate-worse
Metaphorical meaning / actual meaning	From the frying pan into the fire / From bad to worse
Revised as	Lond-on and Lond-off, Par-is and Par-is-not, Berl-in and Berl-out, I-am-sterdam and I-am-not-sterdam
Length	498 words
Lines	60
Students' meeting	1st
Students - L1	Elvira - Spanish Linlin - Mandarin Chinese Marat - Russian Sener - Turkish Shivani - Hindi
Extract	7.4.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Managing the relational and building rapport</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Making an idiomatic phrase of expression more relevant to a wider audience</i>
Analytical focus	It's all Greek to me
Language of origin	English
Actual meaning	It's all incomprehensible to me, I can't understand anything
Revised as	It's all Esperanto to me
Length	606 words
Lines	77
Students' meeting	4 th
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Elvira - Spanish Leonidas - Greek Linlin - Mandarin Chinese
Extract	7.4.2
Pragmatic function	<i>Managing the relational and building rapport</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Making an idiomatic expression more relevant to a wider audience</i>
Analytical focus	For a rainy day
Language of origin	English
Actual meaning	For a future need
Revised as	For a day with adverse weather conditions, for when things go wrong, for when things go the other way
Length	536 words
Lines	62

Students' meeting	5 th
Students - L1	Arvin - Mauritian Creole Elvira - Spanish Leonidas - Greek Linlin - Mandarin Chinese
NB.	<p>All the analytical chapters of this study were built around the extracts which were analysed. For this reason, it was considered more relevant to provide an outline with the analysed extracts. The other option would be to provide an outline of the student meetings which I attended and audio-recorded. This would be useful if for instance each student meeting constituted some sort of case, and in turn if the analytical chapters corresponded to these cases. As this was not the case here, this option was not favoured.</p> <p>As noticed above, different terms were used to refer to the participants' words or expressions which were looked at. Thus, there was the term 'meaning' for words which could be rendered in English in a relatively straightforward way, such as <i>spacibo</i> and <i>xie xie</i> which could be rendered as <i>thank you</i>. 'Approximate meaning' was used when the meaning of a word could not be rendered in English, such as in the case of <i>diaosi</i> and <i>average person</i> and <i>commoner</i>, which is exactly what constituted the analytical focus of the extracts. There were also 'literal meaning' and 'actual meaning', with the former referring to a word by word translation of an idiomatic expression, and the latter referring to what an idiomatic expression could actually be rendered as in English, such as <i>I was bringing the soy sauce</i> which could be rendered as <i>I was helping with minor tasks</i>. 'Metaphorical meaning' was used in the case of <i>from Guatemala to Guatepeor</i>, which was rendered in English as <i>from the frying pan into the fire</i>. Finally, there was 'additional meaning', which had to do with some sort of semantic extension of a word, such as in the case of <i>blin</i>, from <i>pancake</i> to <i>prostitute</i>.</p> <p>Likewise, the term 'refined' was used when there was a partial recast of the culturally contested parts of an idiomatic phrase or expression, for instance, in the case of <i>bringing home the bacon</i> and also <i>hit the bull's eye</i>. The term 'replaced' was used for instance in the case of <i>too many chiefs and not enough Indians</i>, when the students decided to recast it altogether. And 'revised' was used when the idiomatic phrases or expressions were adapted and adjusted to be in accordance to other sociocultural backgrounds beside the ones in which they were initially used, for instance, in the case of <i>for a rainy day</i> which was revised as <i>for when things go wrong</i>.</p> <p>The terms 'language / city/country of origin' was used in the cases of one <i>bell</i>, <i>flash</i> and <i>Himalayan blunder</i>. The aim was to highlight the fact</p>

that these linguistic items initially 'started life' and then 'moved to' English the way that they were used in Birmingham, Nigeria and India, respectively, without ending up using terms such as 'Birmingham English', 'Nigerian English' and 'Indian English'. These terms would tally with the dissecting view of English according to different territories, such as the ones in the paradigm of World Englishes. However, as explained in the literature review chapter, such views are not shared in this study. After all, the very fact that this linguistic items which 'started life' and 'moved to' another language and area by featuring in these students' interactions English in central London, supports the arguments that English usage and use are not and cannot be seen as locked in only to one geographical place.

Likewise, there was the aim to find a way to avoid the term 'L1', but this term was eventually kept, in lack of a better and at the same time widely accepted one in the field for the time being.

APPENDIX 5.

Post-event interviews outline

Chapter 4: Making specific meaning through translanguaging in ELF conversations	
Extract	4.3.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Making specific meaning</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Filling in a lexical gap</i>
Analytical focus	Diaosi and hold zhu
Interviewee	Linlin
Length	175 words
Extract	4.4.2
Pragmatic function	<i>Making specific meaning</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Using some more precise lexis</i>
Analytical focus	One bell and flash
Interviewee	Ales
Words	74 words
Interviewee	Halim
Length	95 words
Chapter 5: Achieving politeness through translanguaging in ELF discussions	
Extract	5.3.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Achieving politeness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Displaying discursive sensitivity by avoiding profanity in English</i>
Analytical focus	Blin and madar chod
Interviewee	Marat
Length	91 words
Extract	5.4.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Achieving politeness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Increasing politeness by showing awareness of the interlocutor's linguistic background</i>
Analytical focus	Spacibo and xie xie
Interviewee	Marat
Length	105 words

Chapter 6: Maintaining cultural appropriateness by means of negotiation in ELF interactions

Extract	6.4.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Maintaining cultural appropriateness</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Replacing a culturally contested expression altogether</i>
Analytical focus	Too many chiefs and not enough Indians
Interviewee	Jose
Length	113 words
Extract	6.4.2 and 6.3.3
Pragmatic function	<i>Maintaining cultural appropriateness</i>
Pragmatic sub-functions	<i>Refining the culturally contested elements of an expression and replacing a culturally contested expression altogether</i>
Analytical focus	Merry Christmas and hit the bull's eye
Interviewee	Breno
Length	141 words
Interviewee	Eshal
Length	169 words

Chapter 7: Managing the relational and building rapport in ELF contexts

Extract	7.3.1
Pragmatic function	<i>Managing the relational and building rapport</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Making an idiomatic expression more relevant to the rest of the in-group</i>
Analytical focus	I was bringing the soy sauce
Interviewee	Linlin
Length	97 words
Interviewee	Winnie
Length	78
Extract	7.4.2
Pragmatic function	<i>Managing the relational and building rapport</i>
Pragmatic sub-function	<i>Making an idiomatic phrase of expression more relevant to a wider audience</i>
Analytical focus	For a rainy day
Interviewee	Arvin
Length	188 words
NB.	Again, as discussed in the previous appendix with the extracts of the naturally occurring spoken discourse, it should be emphasised here too that

	<p>the outline with the interviews was based on the consideration that the chapters had a particular analytical focus and discussed their discerned pragmatic functions and sub-functions, and they were not case studies. This was the reason that it was considered more appropriate to provide here a chapter- by-chapter outline of the extracts from the post-event interviews with the students rather than an interview/interviewee-by-interview/interviewee one.</p> <p>Likewise, as was the case with the outline of the extracts in the previous appendix, only the most important characteristics of the extracts with the interviews were provided here too.</p> <p>Their length was given in terms of words and not in terms of minutes, as these were only extracts of what was thought to be important and useful regarding the analytical focus each time, and other parts were omitted.</p>
--	--

APPENDIX 6.1.

Research ethics approval application



For office use only:
REC Protocol No
Date rec'd:

APPLICATION FOR ETHICAL APPROVAL

Please tick the Committee you are applying to:

Sub-Committees (RESC)

PNM RESC ☐

(Psychiatry, Nursing & Midwifery)

SSHL RESC ☒

(Social Sciences, Humanities & Law
High Risk)

BDM RESC (Health) ☐

(Biomedical & Health Sciences, Dentistry, Medicine
 And Natural and Mathematical Sciences)

Research Ethics Panels (REP)

For SSPP, Humanities and Law (non-high risk only)

E&M REP ☐

(Education & Management)

GGs REP ☐

(Geography, Gerontology, SCWRU)

Humanities REP ☐ **Law REP** ☐ **War Studies REP** ☐

Notes for all applicants

- Please read the guidelines before filling out the application form and refer to the specific guidelines about each section when filling in the form. (<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/research/ethics/applicants/>).
- Refer to the Guidelines for the submission deadlines for your Committee and the number of copies to submit (including electronic versions if applicable).
- All applications should be submitted **by 5pm on the deadline day**.

- All Sub-committee applications should be submitted to the Research Ethics Office, 5.11 Franklin Wilkins Building, (Waterloo Bridge Wing), Waterloo Campus, King's College London, Stamford Street, London SE1 9NH.
- All Research Ethics Panel applications should be submitted to SSPP Ethics Administrator, K0.58 Ground Floor Strand Building, King's College London, The Strand, London WC2R 2LS.

SECTION A – TO BE COMPLETED BY ALL APPLICANTS

1. APPLICANT DETAILS

1.1 RESEARCHER

Researcher's Name: Vasileios (Bill) Batziakas

Researcher's Department & School: Education & Professional Studies

Status:

☐ Undergraduate ☐ Taught Postgraduate ☒ MPhil / PhD/ Specialist Doctorate ☐ Staff Research

If Student:

Name of course/qualification: MPhil/PhD in Education Research

If Staff:

Researcher's Post:

1.2 CONTACT DETAILS

Email: vasileios.batziakas@kcl.ac.uk

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

1.3 SUPERVISOR - COMPLETE FOR ALL STUDENT PROJECTS (Including PhD)

Name of Supervisor: Prof. Constant Leung

Supervisor's Post: Professor of Educational Linguistics, Deputy Head of Department

Supervisor's email address: constant.leung@kcl.ac.uk

1.4 OTHER INVESTIGATORS, COLLABORATORS, ORGANISATIONS

List any other investigators/collaborators involved with the study, and ensure that their role (e.g. collaborator, gatekeeper) and responsibilities within the project are explained. You should include any draft/preliminary approach letters to gatekeeper organisations and confirm that you will have permission letters available for inspection if requested for audit purposes.

NB: For other investigators/collaborators clarify if their employer is not King's College London.

N/A

2. PROJECT DETAILS	
2.1 Project Title	Investigating Meaning-Making in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)
2.2 Projected Start Date of Project This should be when you intend to start work with participants	6th of July 2011
2.3 Expected Completion Date of Project	31st of December 2011
2.4 Sponsoring Organisation Your sponsor will be assumed to be King's College London unless stated otherwise. NB: Do not put 'N/A'	King's College London
2.5 Funder (e.g. self-funded, King's College London, ESRC, AHRB, EU)	Self-funded
2.6 DOES THE STUDY INVOLVE HUMAN PARTICIPANTS OR FOR OTHER REASONS REQUIRE ETHICAL APPROVAL?	
<p>NB: It may be the case that research does not involve human participants yet raises other ethical issues with potential social or environmental implications. In this case you should still apply. Please consult with Ethics Office (rec@kcl.ac.uk) if in doubt.</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	
2.7 OTHER INFORMATION RELATING TO RISK	
<p>Will the study place the researcher at any risk greater than that encountered in his/her daily life? (e.g. interviewing alone or in dangerous circumstances, or data collection outside the UK).</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (The data will be collected in the premises of King's College London and/or the rest of the University of London. Thus, I believe that the study will not place any of the participants at any risk, and there is also no legal or other requirement for CRB clearance.)</p> <p>If applicable:</p> <p>Does the study involve the using a Medical Device outside of the CE mark approved method of use? (see guidelines) If you are using a medical device 'off label' (outside of the approved method of use) then a risk assessment needs to be completed. For further information on medical devices see the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency webpages: http://www.mhra.gov.uk/Publications/Regulatoryguidance/Devices/index.htm and http://www.mhra.gov.uk/Publications/Regulatoryguidance/Devices/GuidanceontheECMedicalDevicesDirectives/index.htm.</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If you have ticked yes to either of the above:</p>	

☐ **Yes**, and I have completed a risk assessment which has been co-signed by the Head of Department/ I have discussed the risks involved with my supervisor or Head of Department and agreed a strategy for minimising these risks.

2.8 OTHER PERMISSIONS, ETHICAL APPROVALS & CRIMINAL RECORDS BUREAU CLEARANCE REQUIRED

ANOTHER REVIEWING BODY/PERMISSIONS - Are any other approvals by another reviewing body (including other ethics committees, gatekeepers and peer review) required? If yes, give details and say when these will be obtained. If they have already been obtained you should provide a copy of the approval with the application otherwise you will need to supply it when ready.

YES ☐ NO ☒

CRIMINAL RECORDS BUREAU - Is Criminal Records Bureau clearance necessary? If so, please confirm that clearance will be sought before commencement of the project. YES ☐ NO ☒

2.9 HUMAN TRIALS QUESTIONNAIRE

Does a **human trials questionnaire** need to be submitted? YES ☐ NO ☒

(<http://kcl.ac.uk/about/structure/admin/finance/staff/insurance/trials.html>)

If yes, confirm that the Human Trials Questionnaire will be submitted prior to the start of the study.

YES ☐

3. AIMS, OBJECTIVES & NATURE OF STUDY

This study seeks to investigate how speakers from different first language backgrounds communicate when they use English as a common language (lingua franca). This will involve looking at what language forms and other discourse features are used, and which competencies are required in addition to those already described in the research literature. The study will focus on the clubs and societies of the Erasmus and international students at King's College London and/or the rest of the University of London.

4. STUDY DESIGN/METHODOLOGY, DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS

Provide a brief outline of the step-by-step procedure of your proposed study, in no more than 1 page where possible. (An example of a flow chart that could be used is in the Guidelines.)

1. Study design

This study will seek to collect data comprising naturally occurring language, such as wordings and other features of discourse, in order to see how meaning-making is achieved. Overall, it will be an empirical naturalistic ethnographic qualitative research study.

2. Data collection

2.1 Meetings of clubs and societies of Erasmus and international students

During the period 6th of July 2011 to 31st of December 2011 (specific dates will be negotiated according to the frequency of the meetings of these clubs and societies), I will seek to attend and audio-record meetings of the Erasmus and international students clubs and societies at King's College London and/or the rest of the University of London.

2.2 Interviews with participants in these meetings

I will also seek to interview and audio-record Erasmus and other international students who participate in these meetings. Each of the interviews will take place once, individually and privately, will last a sufficient amount of time, will be semi-structured, will be audio-recorded, and will seek to elicit information regarding the way they use English in these meetings.

3. Data analysis

The data will be analysed qualitatively drawing eclectically from the traditions of ethnography and conversation analysis. With conversation analysis, there will be focus on the moment-by-moment unfolding of the interaction, looking at conversational openings and adjacency pairs as well as on turn-takings and repairs. Some ethnographic information will also help towards looking at the context of these linguistic interactions as a whole.

5. PARTICIPANTS TO BE STUDIED

5.1 PROJECTED NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Number: I will seek to attend and audio-record 5 meetings of clubs and societies of Erasmus and international students at King's College London and/or the rest of the University of London, and to interview 5 of the members of these clubs and societies. Considering the scope of this research study, this number is deemed sufficient.

If applicable: How many will be male: and female:

Justification for the sample size: As mentioned above (4.), my research will adopt an ethnographic perspective and will employ a qualitative analysis of naturally occurring spoken discourse. This relatively small sample size, then, is considered enough.

If an upper age limit is needed you must provide a justification.

Upper Age Limit:

Lower age limit:

5.2 SELECTION CRITERIA

Data collection participants and sites.

I will seek to collect my data from meetings of clubs and societies of the Erasmus and international students at King's College London and/or the rest of the University of London, both because their use of English qualifies for the purposes of my research study and also because I envisage that I can have a relatively easy access to them.

5.3 RECRUITMENT

Describe how participants will be (i) identified and (ii) approached.

Visiting the website of King's College London Student Union (KCLSU) and the University of London's students union (ULU), I will find out which clubs and societies have to do with Erasmus and other international students. I will then send them an email describing briefly the scope and the methodology of my study and summarising what the participants will be asked to do.

Upon their reply, I will ask them to set up a time to meet and talk more about my study. I will also provide them with the information sheets (Appendix 1) and the consent forms (Appendix 2), and I will ask them to forward it to the members of their clubs and societies.

5.4 LOCATION

State where the work will be carried out, e.g. public place, in researcher's office, in private office at organisation.

The data collection from the meetings of the clubs and societies will be carried out in the communal places where these clubs and societies hold their meetings in the premises of King's College London and/or the rest of the University of London. The interviews will also take place in a communal quiet and public place, which will be agreed in advance between me and the interviewees.

6. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 INFORMED CONSENT

Describe the process you will use to ensure your participants are freely giving fully informed consent to participate. This will **always** include the provision of an information sheet and will normally require a consent form unless it is a purely self-completion questionnaire based study or there is a justification for not doing so (this must be clearly stated). Templates for these are at the end of this document and they should be filled in and modified where necessary.

The participation will be voluntary. All the participants will be provided with an information sheet and with a consent form. I will also orally explain to them the scope and the methodology of the research study in order for them to get a better picture.

All the participants will be over 18 years of age, they will be studying towards a tertiary education degree, and their English language competence will be such that it will have been deemed adequate for them to be accepted at tertiary education in the UK. Therefore, there will be no need on my behalf to translate or adapt the language of the information which will be provided to them in the information sheets and the consent forms as well as in my oral explanations.

Concerning confidentiality, I will guarantee that whatever will be audio-recorded will remain confidential, and as such it will not be disclosed to any public domain which is outside the research community.

Regarding anonymity, all the names of the participants be pseudonymised. Also, any other individual piece of information or combination of pieces of information which could lead to any identification of identities will not be included in the study.

6.2 RIGHT OF WITHDRAWAL

Participants should be able to withdraw from the research process at any time and also should be able to withdraw their data if it is identifiable as theirs and should be told when this will no longer be possible (e.g. once it has been included in the final report). Please describe the exact arrangements for withdrawal from participation and withdrawal of data depending on your study design.

All the participants will be informed that, even if they will have signed the consent form, if they decide at any point during the research study that they no longer wish to participate, they can still withdraw themselves as well as they can withdraw their data if they are identifiable as theirs, by notifying me and without needing to provide any reason or receive any confirmation. They will also be informed, however, that they will not be able to withdraw their data after the completion of the data collection period (31st of December 2011).

6.3 RISK CHECKLIST

Where you have ticked **'yes' on the risk checklist**, provide details of relevant qualifications and experience **with reference to those sections**. This **must** include the researcher and/or supervisor as well as other collaborators (if applicable) involved in those sections marked as presenting risk. (Do not submit a c.v.)

N/A (I have not ticked 'Yes' to any section of the risk checklist.)

You must also specifically address the ethical issues raised from those sections here.

NB: If you ticked 'yes' to any point in E i –vi of the checklist, you must also complete and submit Section B of the application form.

6.4 OTHER ETHICAL ISSUES

Please consider whether there are other ethical issues you should be covering here. Further, **if applicable**, please also add the professional code of conduct you intend to follow in your research (<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/research/ethics/training/codes.html>).

Throughout the research process I will seek to conform to the research requirements and considerations as outlined by the respective institutions and bodies in the UK, such as the 'Statement of Ethical Practice' of the British Sociological Association (BSA 2002), the 'Good Practice in Education Research Writing' and the 'Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research' of the British Education Research Association (BERA 2000, 2011), as well as the 'Recommendations on Good Practice in Applied Linguistics Student Projects' and the 'Recommendations on Good Practice in Applied Linguistics' developed by the British Association of Applied Linguistics (BAAL 2000, 2006).

6.5 BENEFITS & RISKS

Please describe any expected benefits and risks to the research participant. For example:
Will participants receive a copy of the final report?
What is the potential for adverse effects resulting from study participation, e.g.

- participants suffering pain, discomfort, distress, inconvenience or changes to lifestyle.
- sensitive, embarrassing or upsetting topics being discussed/raised.

Identify the potential for each of above and state how you will minimise risk and deal with any untoward incidents/adverse reactions.

There will be neither any expected benefits neither risks to the research participants.

6.6 CRIMINAL OR OTHER DISCLOSURES REQUIRING ACTION

Is it possible that criminal or other disclosures requiring action (e.g. evidence of professional misconduct) could be made during this study?

YES ☐ NO ☒

If yes, detail what procedures will be put in place to deal with these issues. The Information Sheet should make it clear under which circumstances action may be taken by the researcher.

7. FINANCIAL INCENTIVES, EXPENSES AND COMPENSATION

7.1 Will travelling expenses be given? If yes, this should be stated on the Information Sheet

YES ☐ NO ☒

7.2 Is any reward, apart from travelling expenses to be given to participants? If yes, please provide details and a justification for this. It is recommended that participants are informed of the compensation on the information sheet.

YES ☐ NO ☒

7.3 Is the study in collaboration with a pharmaceutical company or an equipment or medical device manufacturer? If yes, please give the name of the company and indicate what arrangements exist for compensating patients or healthy volunteers for adverse effects resulting from their participation in the study (in most cases, the Committee will only approve protocols if the pharmaceutical company involved confirms that it abides by APBI (The Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry) guidelines. A copy of the indemnification form (Appendix C) should be submitted with the application.

YES ☐ NO ☒

7.4 No fault compensation scheme If your study is based in the UK you **must** offer the No-fault compensation scheme to participants unless there is a clear justification for not doing so (if this is the case this must be stated and you should bear in mind that the Sub-Committee reserves the right to make this a condition of approval).

YES, I am making the scheme available to participants ☒

NO, the study is based outside the UK and so the scheme is not applicable ☐

NO, the study is within the UK but the No-fault compensation scheme is not offered for the following reason:

8. DATA PROTECTION, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND DATA AND RECORDS MANAGEMENT

8.a. Confirm that all processing of personal information related to the study will be in full compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) including the Data Protection Principles).

If you are processing any personal information outside of the European Economic Area you **must** explain how compliance with the DPA will be ensured.

YES ☒ NO ☐

8b. What steps will be taken to ensure the confidentiality of personal information? Give details of anonymisation procedures and of physical and technical security measures. Please note to make data truly anonymous **all information** that could potentially identify a participant needs to be removed in addition to names.

As mentioned above (6.1 and 6.4), all the names of the participants will be pseudonymised, while any other individual piece of information or combination of pieces of information which could lead to their identification will not be included in the research study. The anonymity should be further ensured by the fact that Erasmus and international student clubs and societies exist in various colleges of the University of London and not only in King's College London.

The consent forms and any other notes which will be relevant to the research study will be kept in my security key cabinet in the premises of King's College London. The files of the electronic data will be made hidden and will be kept in password-protected folders and subfolders only on the Global Desktop of King's College and on my laptop. On my laptop, I am the sole administrator, there is only my account and it is password-protected, the resume is password-protected after the minimum time wait that is offered by the operational system, and also the remote access has been disabled. The computer is kept in a high security key locker in my room when I am not present, and my hall of residence has a 24/7 security staff policy.

Emails between my supervisors and me which may contain any part of the data and other relevant information will be exchanged only using the college's email accounts. On my laptop, I have disabled the automatic retrieval of my email accounts' usernames and password or equivalent, and access to my college's email account is granted only after providing twice the King's username and password, both of which I have memorised and not saved elsewhere.

8c. Who will have access to personal information relating to this study? Confirm that any necessary wider disclosures of personal information (for instance to colleagues beyond the study team, translators, transcribers, auditors etc) have been properly explained to study participants.

Only my supervisors during their supervision and I will have access to the initial body of the collected data and to any other relevant information.

8d. Data and records management responsibilities during the study. The 'Principal Investigator' is the named researcher for staff projects and the supervisor for student projects.

I confirm that the Principal Investigator will take full responsibility for ensuring appropriate storage and security for all study information including research data, consent forms and administrative records and that, where appropriate, the necessary arrangements will be made in order to process copyright material lawfully.

YES ☒ NO ☐

8e. Data management responsibilities after the study.

State **how long** study information including research data, consent forms and administrative records will be retained, **what format(s)** the information will be kept in and **where** the data will be stored. For example, where within King's College London?
(<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/iss/igc/tools/researchers.html>)

After the completion of the research study and the respective research findings output scheme which is to be followed, the digital recordings on my audio-recorder will be wiped clean, and the files on King's Global Desktop will be deleted. The consent forms will be shredded and discarded in a security bin at King's. Any part of the data which will be contained in emails between my supervisors and me will be deleted, as my email account will be terminated after the programme finishes.

In addition, confirm whether the storage arrangements comply with the Data Protection Act 1998 and the College guidelines.

YES ☒ NO ☐

Will data be archived for use by other researchers?

NO ☒

YES (in anonymised form) ☐ If you intend to share anonymised data with other researchers, you must make this clear on the information sheet.

YES (in identifiable form following the guidance below) ☐

Will any personal information related to this study be retained and shared in unanonymised form? If you tick yes you must ensure that these arrangements are detailed in the Information Sheet and that participant consent will be in place.

YES ☐ NO ☒

9. AUTHORISING SIGNATURES

9.1 RESEARCHER/APPLICANT

I undertake to abide by accepted ethical principles and appropriate code(s) of practice in carrying out this study. The information supplied above is to the best of my knowledge accurate. I have read the Application Guidelines and clearly understand my obligations and the rights of participants, particularly in so far as to obtaining valid consent. I understand that I must not commence research with human participants until I have received full approval from the ethics committee.

Signature 

Date 22/06/2011

9.2 SUPERVISOR AUTHORISATION FOR STUDENT PROJECTS (including PhD)

I confirm that I have read this application and will be acting as the student researcher's supervisor for this project. The proposal is viable and the student has appropriate skills to undertake the research. The Information Sheet and recruitment procedures for obtaining informed consent are appropriate and the ethical issues arising from the project have been addressed in the application. I understand that research with human participants must not commence without full approval from the ethics committee.

If applicable:

The student has read an appropriate professional code of ethical practice ☐

The student has completed a risk assessment form ☐

Name of Supervisor:

Signature

Date

9.3 MEDICAL SUPERVISION (if appropriate – see the Guidelines)

Name of Medical Supervisor:

Medical Supervisor's MDU/MPS (or other insurance provider) number:

Signature of Medical Supervisor:

Date:

10. INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM

Remember to submit your information sheets for participants and consent form (if necessary) with your application. Failure to do so will cause delays to your applications.

The information sheet for participants should be composed according to the guidelines. **The text in red should be deleted or modified as appropriate. If the language in the template is not suitable for your intended participant group it can be modified.** There is also a template consent form that can be used. Please refer to the guidelines for further information on how these documents should be used.

APPENDIX 6.2.

Research ethics risk checklist



Research Ethics – Risk Checklist

- Complete the checklist ticking yes to any of the sections relevant to your study.
- Submit the checklist along with your application to the committee, ensuring each copy of the application has a checklist attached on top.

Name:	Vasileios (Bill) Batziakas
Review Committee:	E&M REP (Education & Management)
Title of Study:	Investigating meaning-making in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

		Yes	No
A	Does the study involve participants who are particularly vulnerable or unable to give informed consent or in a dependent position (e.g. children, your own students, over-researched groups, people with learning difficulties, people with mental health problems, young offenders, people in care facilities, including prisons)? If you have ticked yes to this section, will financial incentives (other than expenses) be offered to participants? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> If yes, please state how much.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B	Will participants be asked to take part in the study without their consent or knowledge at the time or will deception of any sort be involved (e.g. covert observation of people in non-public places)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C	Is there a risk that the highly sensitive nature of the research topic might lead to disclosures from the participant concerning their own involvement in illegal activities or other activities that represent a threat to themselves or others (e.g. sexual activity, drug use, or professional misconduct)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

D	Could the study induce psychological stress or anxiety , or produce humiliation or cause harm or negative consequences beyond the risks encountered in normal life?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
E	Does the study involve physically intrusive procedures? If yes, continue below:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i	Does the study involve only moderately intrusive procedures (<i>taking less than 40ml blood, collecting bodily waste, cheek swabs</i>)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii	Are substances to be administered (such as food substances) which are not classified as 'medicinal products' by the MHRA? (see 15c of the guidelines for more details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii	Are substances which are classified as ' medicinal products ' by the MHRA to be administered? (see 15c of the guidelines for more details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv	Does the study involve imaging techniques such as MRI scans, x-rays or ultrasound?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v	Does the study involve DNA or RNA analysis of any kind? (see Appendix D)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
vi	Are invasive, intrusive or potentially harmful procedures not already covered by items i, ii, iii, iv, & v to be used in this study?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX 6.3.

Information sheet for the participants in research studies

INFORMATION SHEET FOR THE PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH STUDIES



PhD research title:

Investigating meaning-making in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

King's College Research Ethics Committee Ref: REP(EM)/10/11-76

We would like to invite you to participate in this postgraduate research study. You should only participate if you want to. Choosing not to take part will not disadvantage you in any way. Before you decide whether you want to take part, it is important for you to understand why this research study is being conducted and what your participation will involve. Please, take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask us if there is anything which is not clear or if you would like to receive more information.

Aim of the research:

The aim of this research study is to investigate how meaning-making is achieved in contexts where English is used as a Lingua Franca, that is, as a common and shared language of communication between interactants from different linguacultural backgrounds. The research questions which were formulated are: 1) *To what extent is it possible to identify wordings and other features of discourse which are characteristic of interactions in contexts where English is used as a lingua franca, and how do they contribute to meaning-making in ELF interactions?* 2) *To what extent do successful ELF interactions require competences, skills and practices which are additional to those already described in the research literature, and how can they be best described and accounted for?* The study will focus on the clubs and societies of the Erasmus and international students at King's College London and/or the rest of the University of London.

Participants:

I will seek to attend and audio-record meetings of the Erasmus and international students clubs and societies at King's College London and/or the rest of the University of London. Also, I will also seek to conduct and audio-record interviews with members of these clubs and societies asking them some very basic information regarding the way that they used English in these meetings.

Study:

The study will be conducted during the period 6th of July 2011 to 30th of September 2011 (specific dates will be negotiated according to the frequency of the meetings of these clubs and societies), and will involve audio-recordings of meetings and interviews of members of the Erasmus and international students clubs and societies at King's College London and/or the rest of the University of London.

How you will be involved:

If you agree, during the period 6th of July 2011 to 30th of September 2011 (specific dates will be negotiated according to the frequency of the meetings of your club/society), I will attend and audio-record 5 hours of your meetings. I would also like to interview you. Each of the interviews will take place once, individually and privately, will be audio-recorded, and will be about hearing audio-recordings of yourself and reading transcripts of your audio-recorded talk. You may opt to participate only in the audio-recorded meetings of your club/society and not in the interview.

Confidentiality:

I guarantee that whatever will be audio-recorded and whatever else will be collected for the purposes of this research study will remain confidential, in so far as it will not be disclosed to any of your classmates or tutors unless they are the supervisors of this research study. Also, your names, will be pseudonymised, while any other individual piece of information or combination of pieces of information which could actually or potentially lead to any identification will not be included in the study.

Withdrawal of data:

Even if you have decided and signed to participate, you can still withdraw yourselves as well as your data from the research process if it is identifiable as yours, by providing me with a writing notice that you would like to do so and without any need to justify or expect any confirmation of or reply to your decision to do so. You will not be able to withdraw your data, however, 1 month after the data will have been collected from you or in any case after the point when the data will have been organised and made ready for analysis (1st of October 2011).

Contacts:

If you have any questions or problems related to this study, please, do not hesitate to contact either the Researcher or the Project Supervisors.

Researcher:

Vasileios (Bill) Batziakas
PhD student in Education Research
Dept. of Education and Professional Studies
King's College London
Franklin-Wilkins Building
Waterloo Road
London SE1 9NH, UK

Tel.: [REDACTED]

Email: vasileios.batziakas@kcl.ac.uk

If this study has harmed you in any way, you can contact King's College London using the details below for further advice and information.

Project supervisors:

Prof. Constant Leung
Professor of Educational Linguistics
Deputy Head of Department
Dept of Education and Professional Studies
King's College London
Franklin-Wilkins Building
Waterloo Bridge Wing
Waterloo Road
London SE1 9NH
UK

Tel.: +44 (0)20 7848 3713
Fax: +44 (0)20 7848 3182
Email: constant.leung@kcl.ac.uk

Dr Martin Dewey
Lecturer in Applied Linguistics
Dept. of Education and Professional Studies
King's College London
Franklin-Wilkins Building
Waterloo Road
Waterloo Bridge Wing
London SE1 9NN
UK

Tel.: +44 (0)20 7848 3104
Fax: +44 (0)20 7848 3182
Email: martin.dewey@kcl.ac.uk

Please find below a list of possible issues on which I may focus during the classroom observations. You will also find a list of possible topics that may be discussed during the interview. This is just to provide you with an idea of what the classroom observations and interview will cover and to make sure that you are fine with participating in them:

Possible topics of focus in the audio-recordings of your meetings:

- Ways in which the new sentence of a speaker is related to the last sentence of a previous speaker and how it is related to the new sentence of the next speaker.
- Ways in which speakers deal with an English word or expression with which they are not familiar.
- Moments when speakers revert to their mother tongue(s).
- Reasons for which specific lexis is chosen.
- Moments of silence.

Possible topics of focus in the interview:

- Your linguistic background.
- Your English language use in your everyday and academic life.
- Your reflection about the English language use of your colleagues.
- Your views and explanations regarding events which took place while you were using English to communicate with other students from different linguistic and cultural background in your meetings, e.g. what did you do when you came across an unknown English word or expression by your interlocutors, or what did your interlocutors do when they did not understand something that you said.; and why do you think you or your interlocutors made use of particular lexis?

APPENDIX 6.4.

Consent form for the participants in research studies

CONSENT FORM FOR THE PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH STUDIES

Please complete this form after you have read the Information Sheet and/or listened to an explanation about the research.



Title of Study:

Investigating meaning-making in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

King's College Research Ethics Committee Ref: REP(EM)/10/11-76

Thank you for considering taking part in this research. The person organising the research must explain the project to you before you agree to take part. If you have any questions arising from the Information Sheet or explanation already given to you, please ask the researcher before you decide whether to join in. You will be given a copy of this Consent Form to keep and refer to at any time.

- I understand that if I decide at any time during the research that I no longer wish to participate in this project, I can notify the researchers involved and withdraw from it immediately without giving any reason. Furthermore, I understand that I will be able to withdraw my data up to the point that 1 month will have passed after the data will have been collected from me or in any case up to the point that the data will have been organised and made ready for analysis (1st of October 2011).

Please tick or write initials

☐

- I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes explained to me. I understand that such information will be handled in accordance with the terms of the Data Protection Act 1998.

Please tick or write initials

☐

Participant's Statement:

I, _____,
agree that the research project named above has been explained to me to my satisfaction and I agree to take part in the study. I have read both the notes written above and the Information Sheet about the project, and understand what the research study involves.

Participant's Signature:

Date:

Researcher's Statement

I, Vasileios (Bill) Batziakas,
confirm that I have carefully explained the nature, demands and any foreseeable risks (where applicable) of the proposed research to the participant.

Researcher's Signature:

Date:

